The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXI, No. 2 AUGUST, 1949

CONTENTS

A Prayer to Our Lady of Guadalupe
Archbishop Francesco Lardone 81

The Spiritual Life as Communion with God
A Carthusian of Miraflores 83

The Little Office of Our Lady . . *William J. Lallou* 100

The Blessed Virgin and St. Hadrian: Liturgical Birthdays
Alfred C. Rush, C.SS.R. 111

Pontifical Vestments and Exceptions
Blaise Hospodar 120

Episcopacy and Priesthood according to St. Thomas
Joseph Brodie Brosnan 125

The Doctrinal Authority of Papal Encyclicals. Part I
Joseph Clifford Fenton 136

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Stipend for a Bination Mass 151

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00. 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1949, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

Faculties for Hearing a Priest's Confession . . . 151

Obligation to Celebrate the Weekday Mass . . . 152

The "Rhythm" in Pre-Marital Instructions . . . 153

A Puzzling Rubric in the Breviary 154

The Candles on the *Tenebrae* Triangle 154

The Veil on the Crucifix on Good Friday 155

BOOK REVIEWS

De medicina pastorali. *By Jacobus Pujiula, S.J.* . . . 156

With Christ Through the Year: The Liturgical Year in Word and Symbols. *By Rev. Bernard Strasser, O.S.B.* 157

The Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described. *By Adrian Fortescue* 159

Abbot Marmion. *By the Monks of Glenstal* . . . 160

REASON TO REVELATION

by Daniel J. Saunders, S.J.
Weston College

This work of apologetics sets forth and discusses the proofs of the divinity of Christ. The miracles and prophecies of Christ and His resurrection are the subjects of the concluding chapters. Earlier sections establish the authorship and credibility of the Gospels, from which most of the evidence is adduced.

To a remarkable degree the author has kept his arguments free from the technical language of theological textbooks. Thus his work is especially suitable for study clubs and will be found helpful for priests who are preparing addresses on various themes of apologetics.

The argumentation, built up in the order of climax, is sound without being involved, adequate without being verbose, scholarly without being pedantic.

***Reason to Revelation* sets out to prove the divinity of Christ. This it does without being lured into irrelevant discussions. The author, with special attention, solves the difficulties and refutes the objections of modern rationalists and skeptics. $3.50.**

At your bookstore or from the

B. Herder Book Co.

15 and 17 SOUTH BROADWAY
ST. LOUIS 2, MO.

A PRAYER TO OUR LADY OF GUADALUPE

By the force of God's law we are obligated and privileged to love one another with the supernatural affection of divine charity. And, by its very essence, the love of charity involves an order. God wills that we should cherish with a particularly powerful affection those who are nearest to us in the lines of grace and of nature. That is why Our Lord imposes upon His disciples an obligation to nurture in their own lives true sentiments of loyalty within the family, within the diocese or religious community, and within the nation.

Thus, by reason of the fact that we live and work for God in one section of the earth, joined together by common interests and common needs, the people of the Americas are bound to love each other with a special charity. The great efforts of the various Pan-American enterprises tend, of their very nature, towards a goal of unity in charity, a goal which can be attained only by the power of God's grace through the sacrifice of His Son, within His kingdom on earth. The force of charity by which the peoples of the western hemisphere must be bound together is one of those graces which the Mother of God can and will procure for her children in Christ.

Consequently it is not at all astonishing to find that the local title under which Mary is most frequently invoked in the New World is that of a place in the northernmost of the Latin-American republics, a place not far from the border which separates the American nations of the Romance languages from those of the English-speaking north. As the patroness of Pan-American unity, Our Lady of Guadalupe influences her children to turn towards one another in common affection for her and for Our Lord. In the common prayer to her, we find the most perfect expression of that unity of affection Christ wills among His disciples in America.

Interestingly enough, the collection of *Preces et pia opera indulgentiis ditata,* made by the Sacred Apostolic Penitentiary and published in the year 1938, contains one indulgenced prayer to Our Lady of Guadalupe. This prayer was approved and enriched with an indulgence of five hundred days by Pope Pius X at an audience held on Aug. 18, 1908. In this petition we have certain definite objectives which the Church of Jesus Christ wills that its children should seek in their common and filial devotion to Mary.

Our Lady of Guadalupe, mystical rose, make intercession for holy Church, protect the Sovereign Pontiff, help all those who invoke thee in their necessities, and since thou art the ever Virgin Mary and Mother of the true God, obtain for us from thy most holy Son the grace of keeping our faith, sweet hope in the midst of the bitterness of life, burning charity and the precious gift of final perseverance. Amen.

The Church wills that its members in the New World should, in their prayer to their heavenly Mother, show their loyalty to the universal kingdom of God on earth, and should thus, first of all, ask our Lady to pray for the entire company of our Lord's disciples. Then, because the Catholics of the West know well that the forces arrayed against the Church have ever centered their attack on the Rock upon which that Church is founded, their loyalty to Christ impels them to beg our Lady to protect the Vicar of Christ on earth. Again, the people of the Americas, citizens of those lands to which uncounted thousands have come to seek refuge and sustenance, can never forget that the poor and the needy are in a special way the jewels of that realm within which our Lady reigns as queen. Therefore they beseech her to aid by her prayers those who suffer and are in need.

In this prayer, the clients of Our Lady of Guadalupe beg her to procure for them the conservation of their faith, assailed at every hour by the forces opposed to Christ. They ask her to petition God that their hope may never fail amidst the troubles and the cares of this life. They beg her for a burning charity for God, that charity by which they imitate the works of Christ. Finally they ask her to procure for them, by her prayers, the ineffable grace of final perseverance, so that those who are joined to honor her in the kingdom of her Son on earth may be together always in heaven.

This is the direction of our common prayer to Mary. This is the direction of our priestly lives. The work of God's priests in the New World will be crowned with the divine blessings when they labor for these objectives, praying to our Lady for their accomplishment.

✠ Francesco Lardone
Archbishop of Rhizaeum
Apostolic Nuncio to Haiti and the Dominican Republic

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE AS COMMUNION WITH GOD

The spiritual life is a life of charity in the Kingdom of Christ. Even while still on earth, we enjoy in a very real manner, through the communion of the saints, the society of the angels and saints in heaven. But the element of supreme value and importance and the main source of joy and happiness is the life of the soul with God. To lead a spiritual life means to *live with God* a life of divine charity. It is an intercommunion of the mind of the creature with the mind of the Creator. It is a union of the creature's will with the divine will so close and intimate that the creature never even shrinks from, let alone rebels against, the will of God. It is a life in which the whole being of the creature is directed to God and so intellect, will and emotions enjoy oft-repeated absorptions in the consciousness of the divine presence in which the soul turns to and loves God with all its heart and soul and mind and strength.

On the night before His death, after the first Eucharistic banquet and after the traitor had gone forth into the exterior darkness and St. John remained reclining on the bosom of the Master, our Lord commenced to give His apostles certain deep insights into what their spiritual life was going to be.

> If you love me, keep my commandments. And I will ask the Father; and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you forever: the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it seeth him not, nor knoweth him. But you shall know him because he shall abide with you and shall be in you.[1]

"He will abide with you forever." The apostles were to die after a few years; but the Spirit of Truth would abide in the citizens of the Kingdom of Christ on earth and in heaven and that too forever. The earthly Kingdom of Christ will eventually be absorbed into His heavenly Kingdom but the Spirit of Truth will abide forever in the souls of the just, illumining minds to know vaster and ever more profound truths and inspiring wills to love and rise to ever new heights of consecration to God the Supreme Intelligence in the world of intelligent beings.

[1] *John* 14:15-17.

And we who now earnestly set about leading a spiritual life may look forward with confidence to the fulfillment of the promise of Christ that the Father will send us another Paraclete who will abide with us and be in us. And as our spiritual life grows we shall become more and more intimately aware of His abiding. "You shall *know* Him because He shall abide with you and be in you." We shall know Him in those periods that we devote to mental prayer. We shall commence that prayer by coming into the presence of God by a moment of interior silence in which, closing our eyes and our mind to all that is without, we shall open our inner mind to that "interior space" where He abides, the Spirit of Truth Who dwells within us. We shall know Him throughout the day by many acts of interior recollection by which we become conscious of the indwelling of the Spirit of Truth by whose light we realize what we must do and from whom we have strength to carry it into effect. In this way the spiritual life is a deepening of our consciousness of the presence of the Paraclete whom Christ asked the Father to send to us that He might abide with us and be in us and become the guiding principle of all our thoughts and actions.

And then our Lord went on to say: "I will not leave you orphans. I will come to you." [2] He had noticed a kind of trembling of apprehension in their minds at the thought of His departure and any substitution, however sublime, for that divine presence they had learned to know and love in the years of His apostolate.

The first Eucharistic banquet had just been finished. There still abided with them the insight granted them at that banquet into the mystery of transubstantiation and the brilliant illumination it threw on those words spoken on a former occasion: "My flesh is meat indeed; and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me." [3] The sound of His own beloved voice still whispered in their ears. "This is my body, which is given for you. Do this for a commemoration of me. . . . This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you." [4] It was easy to pass from the words "do this in commemoration of Me" to the words "I will not leave you orphans, I will come to you" and the passage was made easier by the in-

[2] *John* 14:18. [3] *John* 6:56-58. [4] *Luke* 22:19-20.

spiration of the Spirit of Truth who had already commenced to abide in the interior of their being.

And they understood the meaning of those words: "I will come to you" in the light of the command: "do this in commemoration of me," spoken as our Lord changed the bread and wine into His own body and blood and then gave Himself to them body, soul and divinity. They knew Him in the breaking of bread and still were feeling the reality of His Eucharistic presence. He would come to them and reign with them in His Eucharistic Kingdom. He would leave the earth but would remain upon the earth. He would sit at the right hand of the Eternal Father in heaven but live in human hearts by His Eucharistic presence. "I will not leave you orphans, I will come to you." "Yet a little while: and the world seeth me no more. But you see me: because I live, and you shall live. In that day you shall know, that I am in my father: and you in me, and I in you."[5]

From that day unto the present there have not been wanting souls who have lived on earth in union with God and His holy angels and saints in Heaven. Christ lived on in them and they in Christ.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE

What do we mean by a good spiritual life? It is a life of perfect charity in which the soul lives in the love of Christ and in communion with the Blessed Trinity in the depths of the Divine Nature.

The details of this life will vary according to the duties of each individual. There is the cloistered religious who has no other duty than the day of prayer outlined by the rule of the order. There are those devout souls in every large city, who daily go to work fasting and at noon hear Mass and receive Communion in a downtown church near their place of work and return in the evening to spend a part of the night in prayer in their little rooms all alone with God. And there are others who can enjoy no such privileges, but have determined to do God's will and avoid all sin and to live with Christ in such fragments of time as they may snatch in passing. But the one thing common to all who live with God in the society of the just is a personal consecration to the love of Christ in virtue of which the soul lives in the love of Christ and in communion with Him.

[5] *John* 14:19-20.

The question which naturally arises in the soul at this moment is: how can I live the life of perfect charity in communion with Christ? If one thinks about this for a moment, the answer is likely to come: You must first learn how much Christ loves you and has been loving you from the day you were born and from all eternity. If you can understand this, you cannot help but return to Christ a perfect love and in this inter-communion of love, you will live the life of perfect charity.

GOD HAS FIRST LOVED US

One of the great mysteries of the universe is God's love for man. Perhaps we may get a more living realization of it by thinking for a moment of a child's love for a pet animal. I remember the delight I had, when a child, in a pet squirrel. When I would let him out of his cage, he would run and sit on my shoulder, nose into my pockets looking for nuts, allow me to stroke his back, and show all the signs of affection that a squirrel was capable of manifesting. There was nothing I would not have done for my squirrel. I would have given my life to save his. And how great was my sorrow and how bitter the tears I shed when he was found one morning, curled up in his cage, dead. Had I been God and he my creature, he never would have died. St. Anselm makes God's love for us a pledge of immortality, arguing thus. If one loved another and could keep that person alive, he would never let him die. But God loves me and He is almighty and can prevent my death, therefore I shall never die.

Our Lord's life is a demonstration of His love for us and a number of passages in the Gospels call special attention to this love.

"Before the festival day of the pasch, Jesus knowing that his hour was come, that he should pass out of this world to the Father, having loved His own who were in the world, he loved them unto the end."[6] His Passion that was now to commence was the great demonstration of God's love for man. "By this hath the charity of God appeared towards us, because God hath sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we may live by him. In this is charity: not as though we had loved God, but because he hath first loved us and sent his Son to be a propitiation for our sins."[7] "For God so loved the world, as to give his only begotten Son; that whosoever believeth in him may not perish, but may have life everlasting."[8]

[6] *John* 13:1. [7] *I John* 4:9-10. [8] *John* 3:16.

In His last discourse to His Apostles our Lord pointed out that His coming Passion and death was a pledge of His love: "Greater love than this no man hath: that a man lay down his life for his friends." [9]

If we respond to Christ's love for us by loving Him with all our heart and soul and mind and strength, we call down upon ourselves the love of the Blessed Trinity: "The Father himself loveth you, because you have loved me." [10] St. Anselm's pledge of immortality finds expression in the words: "Father, I will that where I am, they also whom thou hast given me may be with me." [11]

When we think of returning love to God because God has first loved us and sent His only begotten Son to be a propitiation for our sins, let us not say: "My emotions are not in my power and with the best of effort my heart still remains cold." Because the love that is here spoken of is not an emotion, but a volitional determination arising from the perception of my duty in virtue of an intellectual insight into the nature of God as the omnipotent Creator of heaven and earth, and my insignificance as a creature for whom He has manifested His infinite love by the life and Passion of Christ, His only begotten Son. My duty is clear: absolute consecration of all my power to be, to do, and to suffer to the service of God.

Let me pause for a moment and consider my Lord laying down His life for me upon the cross. I draw forth from the crowd and gaze into the face of Christ with His head bowed upon the cross and looking upon me with an expression that makes me realize how wonderful, how intense, how tender is Christ's love for me. And there escapes from my lips the words, "My Jesus," as I try to give expression to the love for Christ that rises from the depths of my being. Deep within me I seem to hear the accents of His voice: "My child," and there follows a series of pledgings of myself to the absolute service of the God-man who loved me and delivered Himself up for me upon the cross. Perhaps too I will hear our Lord pledging Himself to me, for I did not first love Him and then He responded with His love for me. He loved me before I came into being, before time itself in the countless eons of eternity.

THE DIVINE PROTOTYPE OF THE SOUL IN THE MIND OF GOD

That the mother of Christ was in the mind of God before the be-

[9] *John* 15:13. [10] *John* 16:27. [11] *John* 17:24.

ginning of time is evident from the fact that Holy Mother Church applies the following words to her in the Mass on the feast of the Immaculate Conception:

> The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways, before he made anything from the beginning. I was set up from eternity, and of old before the earth was made. The depths were not as yet, and I was already conceived: neither had the fountains of waters as yet sprung out. The mountains with their huge bulk had not as yet been established: before the hills I was brought forth. He had not yet made the earth, nor the rivers, nor the poles of the world. When he prepared the heavens, I was present: when with a certain law and compass he enclosed the depths: when he established the sky above, and poised the fountains of waters: when he compassed the sea with its bounds, and set a law to the waters that they should not pass their limits: when he balanced the foundations of the earth; I was with him forming all things.[12]

Seeing that the Incarnation of Christ is the supreme goal towards which all creation moves, and the mother of Christ was the divinely chosen instrument of the Incarnation, the sublime idea of her personality must have been in the mind of God from all eternity. Not only that, but the idea of *each individual* existed as a prototype in God before the beginning of time.

This is indicated by reason, pondering on the relationship of love which God has as a matter of fact established between Himself and the human soul. For such is the value of a person to the one who loves that person that all other values shrink into insignificance by comparison. The person whom God loves and who responds to that love by a complete consecration of himself to the divine Lover takes logical precedence over all the material creation. And God never changes. He did not at any time commence to love that person, for God's love, like Himself, is eternal. You, therefore, devout soul leading an earnest spiritual life, have been in the mind of God from all eternity. God loved you before you came into being and brought you into being because He loved you and destined you to live with Him in the depths of His omnipresent divine Nature a life of perfect charity.

St. Paul points out that we were all called to a holy life before the world commenced to be:

[12] *Prov.* 8:22-30.

Labour with the gospel, according to the power of God, Who hath delivered us and called us by his holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the times of the world. But is now made manifest by the illumination of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath destroyed death, and hath brought to light life and incorruption by the gospel.[13]

This divine destiny is not the blessing of a few or even of a vast class of humanity but a privilege granted to *all* men by God "Who will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus: Who gave himself a redemptipn for all." [14] "And Christ died for all; that they also, who live, may not now live to themselves, but unto him Who died for them, and rose again." [15]

Should the soul not respond to God's call to the life of charity, or, having commenced to lead that life, forsake charity and pass over to the kingdom of Satan, God's love for that soul never changes, for His love is eternal. The fickle will of man changes. And God, having granted freedom to the soul never takes away the gift. But His love never ceases, for in Him there is no change or shadow of alteration.

It is true, as St. Thomas points out,[16] that in one sense God loves everything that exists, because nothing can begin to be or continue in existence unless God wills it. But to will a thing to be or to continue to be is to love that thing in some sense of the word love. But this love of a thing, merely as an existing being is not friendship. The love of friendship flows, not from mere existence, but from the beautiful qualities and virtues which characterize an existing being. A painting is not loved and admired for the sake of the canvas on which it is painted, or for the oil paints, as such, that were used in the production of the picture; but for the beauty of the picture that is painted on the canvas.

The love of friendship that God has for every human soul before its creation derives from the prototype of that soul that existed in the mind of God from eternity, and rests upon the realization of that prototype as it develops in time. If the soul forsakes God and is finally lost, there is no longer anything left of the picture

[13] *II Tim.* 1:8-10.

[14] *I Tim.* 2:4-6.

[15] *II Cor.* 5-15.

[16] Cf. *Sum. theol.*, I, q. 20, a. 2.

that was to be painted on the canvas of human nature; and there is nothing on which eternal love can rest in time. God's love did not change, but the moral personality of a human being disintegrated and the picture drawn in time of a divine ideal was finally and utterly destroyed.

Let us therefore strive to be like God and love with a love that will share the divine immutability and so be eternally faithful to Him Who chose us in Christ "before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and unspotted in his sight in charity. Who hath predestinated us unto the adoption of children through Jesus Christ unto himself: according to the purpose of his will." [17] And blessed will he be who will live with Christ a life of charity, listening as he makes known the purpose of His will, and working with Christ to realize it in execution.

THE PROCESS OF OUR SANCTIFICATION

From the moment of our baptism we have been the children of God, having been changed in a spiritual way so as to be in a special manner like unto God. But this change was only a first beginning. There must go on a process of transformation in our soul brought about by a life of charity leading to the practice of the virtues and finally consummated when the soul bursts forth in the transport of love that will perfect its being when for the first time it shall see God face to face. "Dearly beloved," wrote St. John, "we are now the sons of God; and it hath not yet appeared what we shall be. We know, that, when he shall appear, we shall be like to him, *because* we shall see him as he is. And everyone that hath this hope in him sanctifieth himself, as he also is holy." [18]

In this process of our sanctification Faith and Charity work hand in hand. "Now this is eternal life: That they may know thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." [19] As the soul commences to walk with God, like Henoch of old,[20] divine faith grows and the knowledge of God increases in the soul till at times it becomes something akin to vision. And Christ abides in His servant and fills his mind with holy thoughts and speaks through his mouth and works through the instrumentality of his hand until His servant is in truth another Christ. And so the soul

[17] *Eph.* 1:4-5.
[18] *I John* 3:2-3.
[19] *John* 17:3.
[20] Cf. *Gen.* 5:24.

experiences that indwelling of the Holy Spirit, promised by our Lord; and lives with Christ and carries out the designs of the Eternal Father and moves and has its being in the depths of the Blessed Trinity.

It was this that St. Paul prayed might come about in his beloved Ephesians when he wrote:

> For this cause I bow my knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Of whom all paternity in heaven and earth is named, That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened by his Spirit with might unto the inward man, That Christ may dwell by faith in your hearts; that being rooted and founded in charity, You may be able to comprehend, with all the saints, what is the breadth, and length, and height, and depth: To know also the charity of Christ, which surpasseth all knowledge, that you may be filled unto all the fulness of God.[21]

And so may we attain to that blessed knowledge: the inner experience of Christ's love for us; and "doing the truth in charity, we may in all things grow up in him Who is the head, *even* Christ." [22]

This is the spiritual life that God willed from the beginning should be the joy and the possession of every man and should grow and increase within him till he should attain the divine ideal that God conceived of him before time was in the eternity of His Being. "For of his own will hath he begotten us by the word of truth, that we might be some beginning of his creature." [23] That this will of God, designing what we should be and guiding us to attain our sublime vocation, was in the mind of God from all eternity St. James suggests by preluding these words with the statement: "Every best gift, and every perfect gift, is from above, coming down from the Father of lights, with whom there is no change, nor shadow of alteration." [24]

In this process of transformation you must look to God for its initiation, continuation and consummation, being careful never to put any block or hindrance in the way of divine action by the perversity of your own will seeking what you want and not the divine ideal, "Being confident of this very thing ,that he who hath begun a good work in you, will perfect it unto the day of Christ Jesus." [25]

[21] *Eph.* 3:14-19.
[22] *Eph.* 4:15.
[23] *James* 1:18.
[24] *James* 1:17.
[25] *Phil.* 1:6.

TRANSFORMATION OF BODY AND SOUL

This process of sanctification will involve much suffering. For without suffering we cannot pass from the natural cravings of the body for comforts and satisfactions of many kinds to the enjoyment of the spiritual delights of a citizen of the Kingdom of heaven. Therefore our Lord warned us: "Such as I love, I rebuke and chastise." [26] St. Paul too points out that our transformation involves not only a spiritual change but a gradual *transformation of the body itself* laying aside old practices and habits with their traces in the nervous system and acquiring new. "We ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption of the sons of God, the redemption of our body. For we are saved by hope. But hope that is seen, is not hope. For what a man seeth, why doth he hope for? But if we hope for that which we see not, we wait for it with patience." [27] That which we see not and wait for with patience, groaning with the labor of its accomplishment is our future state of perfect sanctity as a citizen of the eternal Kingdom.

St. Paul warns us against following those "that are enemies of the cross of Christ: whose end is destruction: whose God is their belly: and whose glory is in their shame: who mind earthly things" and then goes on to point out that we must live like the saints in heaven, awaiting help from our Lord who will transform not only the soul *but the body also* till our whole life takes on something of the character of the mode of being of the saints in glory. "But our conversation is in heaven; from whence also we look for the Saviour, our Lord Jesus Christ, Who will reform the body of our lowliness, made like to the body of his glory, according to the operation whereby also he is able to subdue all things unto himself." [28]

Let us not however think that we are passive spectators of the transformation that Christ is going to work in our body and in our soul. With our Lord's help we must conceive of the divine ideal that God formed of our personality and willed from all eternity to come into being. And with a clear knowledge of our end we must labor, with all that we can command, towards its accomplishment, making promptly and generously the sacrifices that will be asked of us, one after another, in the course of a lifetime.

[26] *Apoc.* 3:19. [27] *Rom.* 8:23-25. [28] *Phil.* 3:20-21.

The things that were gain to me, the same I have counted loss for Christ. Furthermore I count all things to be but loss for the excellent knowledge of Jesus Christ my Lord; for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and count them but as dung, that I may gain Christ. . . . That I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable to his death, If by any means I may attain to the resurrection which is from the dead. Not as though I had already attained, or were already perfect; but I follow after, if I may by any means apprehend, wherein I am also apprehended by Christ Jesus. Brethren, I do not count myself to have apprehended. But one thing *I do*: forgetting the things that are behind and stretching forth myself to those that are before, I press towards the mark, to the prize of the supernal vocation of God in Christ Jesus.[29]

GOD GAVE HIMSELF TO MAN IN CREATION

It is not surprising that at God's invitation the soul should give itself without reserve to its Creator. But what amazes one when he commences to realize it somewhat adequately is the completeness with which God gives Himself to the soul. Creation itself was but the first step in a series by which God designed to give Himself to man.

When we ask ourselves what was God's purpose in bringing out of nothing the world in which we now live, reason tells us that creation has in itself by its very nature an objective end or purpose. But we can also speak of God's subjective purpose in creating the world. Thus the objective end and purpose of a watch is to tell time. But the one who made it might not have done so in order that he would have an instrument with which to tell time, but in order to sell it and buy other things that he might need.

Now the objective end of creation is to show forth the power and wisdom of the Creator. "The heavens shew forth the glory of God, and the firmament declareth the work of his hands." [30] Just as an author reveals himself in his writings, and cannot avoid doing so, so the effect tells the nature of the cause, and creation points out the magnificence of the Creator.

For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made; his eternal power also, and divinity: so that they are inexcusable.. Because that, when they knew God, they have not glorified him as God or given

[29] *Phil.* 3:7-9, 10-14. [30] *Psalm* 18:2.

thanks; but became vain in their thoughts, and their foolish heart was darkened.[31]

The objective end of creation therefore is to reveal God and His Infinite Being to every mind that is capable of an intellectual perception of the created universe. But we may also ask: what subjective purpose did God have in the creation of the universe? And the answer is beautifully expressed in the words of the Cathechism of the Council of Trent:

> For God did not fashion the world out of any kind of matter, but created it out of nothing, and in so doing He was not compelled by any force or necessity but acted spontaneously and by volitional choice. Nor was there any other cause that impelled Him to the work of creation than that he should impart His goodness to the things that were made by Him. For the nature of God is most blessed in itself and stands in need of nothing. Hence David said, "I have said to the Lord: Thou art my God, for Thou hast no need for my goods."

But for God to impart His Goodness to creatures is to give Himself in some manner to His creatures, for as St. Thomas points out, God is not only good, but in virtue of the unique character of His being, He is Goodness itself.[32]

GOD GIVES HIMSELF TO HUMANITY IN THE INCARNATION

The fullness of God's design was hidden from all eternity, till with the preaching of the Gospel, commenced by Christ and continued by the Church, there was unfolded the sublimities of the mystery of the Incarnation and the Eucharistic life of the soul with Christ and of Christ with the soul.

"To me," wrote St. Paul, "the least of all the saints, is given this grace, to preach among the Gentiles, the unsearchable riches of Christ, And to enlighten all men, that they may see what is the dispensation of the mystery which hath been hidden from eternity in God, who created all things: That the manifold wisdom of God may be made known to the principalities and powers in heavenly *places* through the church, According to the eternal purpose, which he made, in Christ Jesus our Lord."[33]

Again he writes:

[31] *Rom.* 1:20-21. [32] *Contra gent.* I, 38. [33] *Eph.* 3:8-11.

And you, whereas you were some time alienated and enemies in mind in evil works: Yet now he hath reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unspotted, and blameless before him: If so you continue in the faith, grounded and settled, and immoveable from the hope of the gospel which you have heard, which is preached in all the creation that is under heaven, whereof I Paul am made a minister. Who now rejoice in my sufferings for you, and fill up those things that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ, in my flesh, for his body, which is the church: Whereof I am made a minister according to the dispensation of God, which is given me towards you, that I may fulfill the word of God: The mystery which hath been hidden from ages and generations, but now is manifested to his saints.[34]

Let us glance for a moment at certain elements in the teaching of the Gospels to bring clearly before our minds the outlines of that mystery hidden from ages and generations but now manifested to the citizens of the heavenly Kingdom.

St. Paul commences to outline this mystery in the opening lines of his Epistle to the Hebrews.

God, who at sundry times and in divers manners, spoke in times past to the fathers by the prophets, last of all, In these days hath spoken to us by his son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the world. Who being the brightness of his glory, and the figure of his substance, and upholding all things by the word of his power, making purgation of sins, sitteth on the right hand of the majesty on high.[35]

St. Paul, with the Church of the first century, expresses with crystal clarity the divinity of the Saviour who came and redeemed man by His Passion and death. The divinity of the Christ, who was to redeem the human race, was not entirely hidden in the ages that preceded His coming, but found expression in prophecy in such passages as that of Isaias: "Take courage, and fear not. Behold your God will bring the revenge of recompense: God, himself will come and will save you." [36] And "A CHILD IS BORN TO US, and a son is given to us, and the government is upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called, Wonderful, Counsellor, God the Mighty, the Father of the world to come, the Prince of Peace." [37] But along with various other elements in the idea of Christ made

[34] *Col.* 1:21-26.
[35] *Heb.* 1:1-3.
[36] *Isaias* 35:4.
[37] *Isaias* 9:6.

known by prophecy the concept of the divinity of the Messiah was lost in the picture woven by wishful thinking of a human prince who would conquer Rome and give to Judaism the empire of the world.

That this was not to be was made clear by the prophecy of the Passion of Christ.

> There is no beauty in him, nor comeliness: and we have seen him, and there was no sightliness, that we should be desirous of him: Despised, and the most abject of men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with infirmity . . . he was wounded for our iniquities, he was bruised for our sins: the chastisement of our peace *was* upon him; and by his bruises we are healed.[38]

GOD GIVES HIMSELF TO HUMAN SOULS IN THE EUCHARIST

But there are elements in Christian revelation which were not given in prophecy even by a foreshadowing of the sublimity of their doctrine. These elements are particularly those that center around our reception of the Eucharist, which our Lord commenced to make known shortly after the multiplication of the loaves and fishes had prepared the minds of the Apostles to approach to an understanding of the multiplication of His presence in the Eucharistic tabernacles of the future.

> I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever; and the bread that I will give, is my flesh, for the life of the world. The Jews therefore [whose minds were unprepared for this revelation by prophecy or tradition] strove among themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said to them: Amen, amen I say to you: Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath everlasting life: and I will raise him up in the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed: and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him.[39]

In these last words our Lord expresses the purpose of His Eucharistic presence. He wanted to give Himself to human beings with transcendent fullness. And this Eucharistic donation of His very self was the essence of the mystery hidden in God from all eternity.

[38] *Isaias* 53:2-5.

[39] *John* 6:51-57.

St. Paul made known this mystery, hidden from ages and generations past, in his account of the first Eucharistic banquet:

> I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread. And giving thanks, broke, and said: Take ye, and eat: This is my body, which shall be delivered for you: this do for the commemoration of me. In like manner also the chalice, after He had supped, saying: This chalice is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of me. For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord, until he come. Therefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord.[40]

There is a picture by Rubens which represents the dramatic moment in which Christ first pronounced the Eucharistic words of consecration. Our Lord is standing. A light seems to radiate from His countenance and shine upon the faces of the kneeling Apostles. And on their faces the artist has contrived to depict that gleam of insight with which every teacher is familiar who has explained a difficult point to a student. There comes a moment when suddenly the student comprehends and the gleam of comprehension manifests itself in his face with a characteristic expression. So it was with the Apostles. To them as well as to the ordinary Jew the first enunciation of the mystery of the Eucharist was a hard saying. They could not understand it. But unlike those disciples who "went back and walked no more with him," they waited in patience till the mystery hidden from eternity in God should be explained. And when our Lord pronounced the words: "this is my body . . . this chalice is the new testament in my Blood," they recalled that sublime discourse at Capharnaum that had troubled their minds ever since and for whose explanation they had long waited in patience. Now by the grace of the Holy Spirit they saw all. He that multiplied the loaves and fishes and that same night drew nigh to them walking upon the sea, He was Lord and Master of the material universe. He could change instantly the bread and wine into His own body and blood and His flesh could thus be their meat indeed and His blood their drink indeed and so they would live in Christ and Christ in them.

[40] *I Cor.* 11:23-27.

THE EUCHARISTIC UNION AND THE LIVING BODY OF THE CHURCH

So often does our Lord speak of his disciples abiding in Him and He in them and of their union with the eternal Father in the Blessed Trinity, that we must look upon this union of the faithful with God in one body as one way in which we may conceive of the supreme end of all creation.

> And for them do I sanctify myself, that they also may be sanctified in truth. And not for them only do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in me; That they all may be one, as thou, Father, in me, and I in thee; that they also may be one in us; that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou hast given me, I have given to them; that they may be one, as we also are one: I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast also loved me.[41]

The Eucharist, therefore, unites the soul not only to the humanity of Christ but to the divinity with which it is inseparably connected. In our morning Communion we receive Christ in whom the Eternal Father dwells; and Christ has His being in the Eternal Father and the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth who proceedeth from the Father. We are united to the humanity of Christ who is the second person of the Blessed Trinity and to the Father who is in Christ while Christ has His being in the Father, and to the Holy Spirit of Truth who abides with us and in us.

Although the presence of the sacred humanity of Christ is not permanent it works a change in the body and soul of man and brings about a union of sanctifying grace which effects a constant abiding of God in the soul of the Christian who is faithful to the commandments of Christ. "If any one love me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him; and we will come to him, and will make our abode with him." [42] The Christian soul becomes the temple of God. "Know you not," wrote St. Paul, "that you are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" [43]

And so while remaining in the world and executing the mission for which you were sent into the world, Christ keeps you from evil, having sanctified you in truth by baptism and the Eucharist and His holy sacraments. He has made of you "a chosen generation,

[41] *John* 17:19-23. [42] *John* 14:23. [43] *I Cor.* 3:16.

a kingly priesthood, a holy nation, a purchased people: that you may declare his virtues, who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light." [44]

As we continue to live a eucharistic life there will come to us an abiding consciousness of our union with Christ and the saints in light. We shall belong to and live in the world of Christ and His blessed in heaven. We shall walk with God like Henoch of old.

We live even now in the midst of things we cannot see. We are ever in the presence of God, the source and origin of all that is, the Infinite Reality in whom we live and move and have our being. Step by step, with the fleeting moments of time, we move on, ever in the presence of God who seeth all, until we shall come to His judgment seat who will pass final and irrevocable sentence on the value of the years that have been granted us in time in order to establish our place in eternity. That period of our life will at last come when we must give up the things that pleased us so much and enter upon the days that please us not. No more shall we be as yesterday and the day before. We shall not appear in our familiar place; and men shall miss our presence where once we used to come so often. Finally the last word of the chapter of a human life will have been written. The world will whirl on in space and the soul will be caught up and carried into the presence of Christ and be face to face with Infinite Reality.

How important it is for a human mind to become conscious early in its career of our Christian destiny and all that it implies; and to listen with attentive ears to the divine invitation which the beloved disciple has expressed so beautifully: *"Love not this world nor the things which are in the world. . . . For all that is in the world, is the concupiscence of the flesh, and the concupiscence of the eyes, and the pride of life, which is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the concupiscence thereof: but he that doth the will of God, abideth forever."* [45]

A Carthusian of Miraflores

Burgos, Spain

[45] *I John* 2:15-17.
[44] *I Peter* 2:9.

THE LITTLE OFFICE OF OUR LADY

The liturgy perfectly mirrors the exalted position of our Lady in the Church. The fundamental doctrine of Christianity is that of the Incarnation of the Word of God. The manner, divinely ordained, by which the Word became flesh and dwelt among us involves the Blessed Virgin Mary. When the Eternal Son became man, He did not elect to assume a heavenly body, mysteriously fashioned by the hands of angels, but He chose to be born into the world through the co-operation of Mary. He became man of her. She was the mould in which His sacred Humanity was cast. Her flesh and blood were the source of His holy Body and precious Blood. Mary is His mother and He is her Son. So, the Church throughout the ages has loved to glorify Mary whom God Himself has so signally honored. Therefore, the Church has multiplied feasts in her liturgy in honor of Mary, observing the day of her birth and the day of her Assumption, celebrating the privileges of her Immaculate Conception and her Maternity, commemorating her joys and her sorrows.

The Church reiterates every day her greetings to Mary, saluting her as Mother, Virgin, and Queen in the invocations of the Litany of Loreto. Mary's image is in every Catholic home and her rosary in the hands of every child of the Church. In the liturgy, the official public worship of the Church, we find nineteen special Masses in the Missal, in addition to votive and similar Masses and twenty-three particular ones for feasts of our Lady restricted to certain places. The Breviary reproduces for the Divine Office the observance of the feasts of our Lady for which the Missal provides Masses. In addition to the solemn, liturgical cult of Mary, there are other devotions in her honor, high in favor with the faithful. These include the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin, which ranks also as a liturgical prayer, because it is found in the Breviary, an official service book of the Church, though its recitation in choir is no longer a matter of added obligation for those who are bound to the public performance of the canonical hours.

The Little Office *de Beata* was originally an increment added to the Divine Office when it was recited in choir. Later, but still in medieval times, it found its way into popular prayer-books as a devotion for the laity. With the reform of the Breviary after the

Council of Trent, supplementary hours and additional psalms, like those called the gradual and penitential psalms, were much reduced on the occasions when they were of obligation and the reform of Pope Pius X suppressed them entirely as epilogues of the Divine Office.

The Little Office of our Lady still continues to be *de rigueur* with the Trappists and the Carthusians, who recite it daily in addition to the canonical hours of the long office. The Franciscans for now some centuries have substituted the final anthems of the Blessed Virgin, which we all say at the end of the office, for the supplementary hours *de Beata*. The Dominicans, who had retained the practice even after the Tridentine reform, abolished it altogether after the *Divino afflatu* of Pius X, regarding the daily recitation of the rosary as taking its place.[1]

The Little Office at present serves as the liturgical prayer, instead of the greater office of the Breviary, for lay brothers and lay sisters in some of the contemplative orders. It also forms the daily choir service of most of the congregations of women whose members are engaged in educational and other active work. To a limited extent, the hours of our Lady furnish a daily prayer for the laity, who are unequal to the complexity of the Divine Office or have not sufficient time to devote to it. Vespers and Compline of this office are the usual service of prayer at the meetings of parish branches of the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin. It is customary, in some seminaries, especially during the month of May, for the seminarians, not yet promoted to major orders, to recite daily the short Marian office. Concessions are occasionally made, *per modum gratiae,* to substitute this office for the canonical hours, when the recitation of the latter becomes difficult.

According to Msgr. Batiffol,[2] the first mention which we have of the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin dates from the eleventh century and comes from the Camaldolese abbey of Fonte Avellano, in Italy. Cardinal Baronius is quoted as attributing the institution of this daily office to St. Peter Damian who was a monk of this abbey before he became a cardinal and bishop of Ostia. Batiffol doubts this but admits as certain that St. Peter Damian worked very hard to spread the practice of reciting this office of our Lady.

[1] Cf. Wm. Bonniwell O.P., *A History of the Dominican Liturgy,* p. 349.

[2] Cf. Batiffol, *History of the Roman Breviary,* p. 147.

At all events, during the second half of the eleventh century the custom of reciting daily the *Horae de Beata* had extended throughout Italy and into France and Germany and even beyond the Continent into England. By the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, this liturgical observance, added to the canonical hours of the Divine Office, was of general practice. It was late, however, in reaching Rome, where we first find it during the Pontificate of Innocent III (1198-1216). Some trace the origin of the Little Office to an earlier date than the eleventh century.[3] A *Cursus in honore S. Mariae* is cited as evidence of the existence of the Little Office in the tenth century but Batiffol regards this and similar prayers more in the nature of what we now call a *suffragium* than an *officium plenum* and points out that the *Cursus* was not a *daily* office but an appendix to the Divine Office only on certain days, namely, Saturdays on which feasts of saints were not celebrated. The question of the Little Office is one of the daily addition of an abbreviated office of our Lady to the hours of the Breviary, like the similar appending of the daily office of the dead, and not something in the nature of a commemoration, or suffrage.

As time went on into the fourteenth century, there was opposition to the burdening of the already long office with rather lengthy epilogues, like the seven penitential psalms, the gradual psalms, the office of the dead and the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin. The last named was to be said, in addition to the canonical hours, on every day of the year, except the greater festivals, the last three days of Holy Week, the octave of Easter, and the feasts of our Lady herself. The *Constitutiones Lateranenses* of Gregory XI (1370-78) prescribed that the office of the hours of the Breviary of the Curia was to be sung (*cum nota*) and then followed every day by the recitation (*sine nota*) of the office of the Blessed Virgin.[4] The Franciscans were accused of multiplying feasts of nine lessons in order to get rid of the obligation of adding to the office the penitential and gradual psalms and the office of the dead. They were also charged with growing laxity in the observance of the daily recital of the office of our Lady. So, it is not surprising that in the proposals for the reform of the Breviary, made especially in the sixteenth century, there was always included that of suppressing

[3] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 147 n.

[4] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 170 n.

additions to the office which made it unduly prolix and increased its compexity.

When, after the Council of Trent, Pope St. Pius V published the reformed Breviary, the occasions on which the gradual and penitential psalms were to be said were reduced to the Wednesdays of Lent for the former and the Fridays for the latter. The office of the dead was confined to the first of each month, ember days and vigils, and every Monday in Advent and Lent. The Little Office of our Lady became of obligation only on Saturdays but with the exception of Ember Saturdays, vigils, and the Saturdays of Lent. This continued to be the rule until the revision ordered by Pius X, in the Bull *Divino afflatu,* 1911, which resulted in the Breviary of to-day. This decree abrogated entirely the rubrics which prescribed the recitation in choir of the Little Office of our Lady, the office of the dead, and the gradual and penitential psalms. Since that time, the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin, remaining still a liturgical prayer, included in the Breviary, has become a private devotion and a substitute for the Divine Office in certain religious congregations of men and women. The small office is still in high honor and indulgences are attached to its recitation even by those for whom it is of obligation.[5]

The Little Office of our Lady figured in the contents of the common medieval prayer-book for the laity, the *Prymer,* or, in its Latin version, *Primarium.* An interesting example of such a prayer book, with a collation of varying texts, was published by the Early English Text Society, under the title of *Prymer, or Lay Folks' Prayer Book.*[6] The *Prymer* contained those forms of prayer which, having been accretions added to the Divine Office for those obliged to the recitation of it, passed into popular devotions of the laity in substitution for the longer canonical hours which they had ceased to attend. The normal contents of the medieval *Prymer* were: the Hours of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the seven penitential psalms, the fifteen gradual psalms, the litany of the Saints, the office for the dead, and the "commendations," which mean Psalm 118, divided into twenty-two sections, and Psalm 138, concluding with a prayer for the faithful departed.

[5] Cf. *Raccolta,* n. 289.

[6] *Early English Text Society,* Nos. 105, 109 (London, 1895 and 1897).

While there are minor variations in the English primer between the more prevalent usage of Sarum and those of York, Durham, and Hereford, the structure of the hours of our Lady was substantially identical in all the extant texts of her office. Matins has the opening verses, the *Venite exultemus,* the hymn *Quem terra,* the three psalms at present found appointed to be said on Sundays, Mondays, and Thursdays (Nos. 8, 18, and 23), each with its "Glorie be to the fadir," three lessons, shorter than and different from the present ones, each with a brief responsory following it, and the *Te Deum* at the end. The office of Lauds is like to-day's with the same psalms and the *Benedicite* canticle, but Psalm 66 is added to Psalm 62 and Psalms 149 and 150 are appended to 148, making eight in all, including the canticle, instead of the five as we have them. There follow the little chapter, the hymn *O gloriosa,* the *Benedictus,* its antiphon and a V. and R., the prayer *Concede,* and then, in place of our suffrage of the saints, a series of three prayers, each with an antiphon and a V. and R. At the end of Lauds and of each of the succeeding hours, there is a proper antiphon of the Passion, to which reference will be made later. Prime, Tierce, Sext, and None show an identical structure with the opening verses, the hymn, three psalms, an antiphon, the little chapter, a V. and R., the prayer, in each instance the familiar *Concede nos,* and the concluding commemoration of the Passion, the antiphon varying for each hour. Instead of our repeated hymn *Memento rerum Conditor,* the medieval day hours had the *Veni Creator,* "Come holi goost." Vespers of the medieval little office had five psalms, but they were, with the exception of the *Laetatus sum,* different from the present ones, being in succession psalms 121, 122, 123, 124, and 125. The antiphon, the little chapter, and the hymn followed. The last named was, as now, the *Ave maris stella.* This had its V. and R., which introduced the *Magnificat* and its concluding antiphon, which was *Sancta Maria succurre miseris.* The oration *Concede* followed and the hour concluded with another antiphon of the Passion with its V. and R. and oration. Compline began as does ours, but had four psalms (Nos. 12, 42, 128, and 130) instead of the three which are now said. Then came the concluding antiphon, the little chapter, and the hymn. A hymn *Virgo singularis* was found in place of our *Memento rerum Conditor,* which we repeat from the day hours. The V. and R. following the hymn are suc-

ceeded by the *Nunc dimittis,* an antiphon, another V. and R. and the prayer, *Gratiam tuam,* which with us is said as the oration after the *Alma Redemptoris Mater* of Advent. Compline concluded with the usual commemoration of the Passion, similar to that found at the end of the other hours. Only two, instead of our four, anthems of the Blessed Virgin, appear after Compline of the medieval *Prymer.* These are the *Salve Regina* and the *Ave Regina coelorum.* The *De profundis,* omitted from the series of psalms at Compline, comes at the conclusion of the office with a number of versicles and responses and a final prayer for the faithful departed.

In explanation of the commemoration of the Passion at the end of each hour of the medieval form of the little office, let us state that it consisted of an antiphon, which varied in each instance, followed by identical verses and responses and an unvarying oration. The changing antiphon of the Passion was accommodated to suit the traditional hour of different phases of our Lord's sufferings and death. His taking by the soldiers formed the subject of the antiphon at Lauds. Prime commemorated His appearance before Pilate, Tierce the crowning with thorns and the carrying of the cross, Sext His nailing to the cross and the offering of "galle," and None recalled His death and the piercing with the "spere." The Vesper antiphon remembered the taking down from the cross and that of Compline the entombment in the sepulchre. This commemoration of the Passion was most probably the surviving remnant of "the hours of the Passion," another medieval accretion of the Divine Office.

According to Fr. Herbert Thurston, S. J.,[7] the origin of the word "Primer," applied to a prayer-book for the laity in the later middle ages, is connected with the primer for children. We still speak, or we used to do so until recent years, of a primer, meaning a first reading book for children. In medieval times instruction in reading was given to children with the more or less definite idea that the child would become a cleric, hence along with the alphabet, he learned the *Pater* and *Ave* and gradually, as he advanced in his studies, the psalms which a cleric should know by heart. A sixteenth century *Primarium pro pueris* contained the Little Office of our Lady and other prayers. Fr. Thurston has no doubt that the *prymer,* spoken of in Chaucer's "Prioress's Tale," from which "this

[7] Cf. art. "Primer," *Catholic Encyclopaedia,* XI.

litel child" learned "as he sat in the scole" was a religious manual similar to that which we have just described. Attention is also called to the definition of the word "primer" as late as Dr. Johnson's Dictionary (1773) where it is identified with "a small prayer-book in which children are taught to read." Medieval primers, with the office of our Lady and that for the dead, usually known as *Horae* in Latin editions, were common not only in the days of manuscript but there were many printed copies after the invention of movable type. Some of these books were elaborately illuminated with pictures, which often seem very quaint to-day, especially the more macabre ones found along with the hours of the office for the dead.

A comparison between the text of our little office and that found in extant copies of medieval books of hours shows an identity, save in unimportant details, such as appear in some of the hymns and orations and, less frequently, in the selection of psalms. The most striking difference is the complement to each hour in the form of a commemoration of the Passion varied through the day to correspond to the stages of the sad events of the last hours of our Lord's life on earth. The *Regina coeli* and the *Alma Redemptoris Mater* are lacking in the anthems terminating the little office at the end of Compline, though both date from periods antecedent to the general use of the *Prymer*. Perhaps the basis of the explanation of this omission is that it was not till the sixteenth century that the four anthems of our Lady at the end of the canonical hours became a universal substitute for the office of the Blessed Virgin when this began to be no longer daily appended to the choral service of the Breviary.

The Little Office of our Lady, as it was originally and as we have it today, is constructed on the general pattern of the Divine Office. Lauds and Vespers are, apart from several variations in detail, duplicates of these same hours in the common office of the Blessed Virgin of the Breviary. Matins is divided into three nocturns, each consisting of three psalms and three lessons, but only one nocturn is recited each day. Prime resembles that of the long office but lacks the chapter section which is the second part of that hour in the Breviary. The other day hours are of the familiar structure of a hymn, three psalms, a little chapter, a short responsory, and an oration. Compline has none of the features, which distinguish that

hour as a form of night prayer in the Divine Office, consisting merely of three psalms, a hymn, a little chapter, the *Nunc dimittis,* and an oration. The office concludes with one of the four anthems of the Blessed Virgin, the same as are said at the end of the long office.

The little office shows slight variation in its recitation throughout the year. There are, however, some changes, chiefly in the antiphons, outside of Matins, and in the three lessons of the single nocturn, which justify the distinction into three offices proper to as many seasons of the year. These three are: the first, from the Purification to Advent; the second, for the time of Advent; the third from the first Vespers of Christmas until the Purification, inclusive. It is strange that the little office has no special form, with multiplied Alleluias, for the season of Easter. The *Te Deum* terminates Matins throughout the year, except during Advent and Lent, when its place is taken by a third responsory after the final lesson. A commemoration of the saints, with a variant for the season of Advent, structurally resembling the *suffragium* of the canonical hours, is appended to the oration at Lauds and Vespers. We find nothing in the nature of the *Preces* of the Divine Office. The absolution and the blessings before the lessons of Matins are the ones which are familiar to all clergy in major orders as they are identical with those recited in the *Officium S. Mariae in Sabbato* of the long office.

The text of the Little Office shows an *à propos* which is the resultant of the pious tradition of centuries. The psalms are some Messianic and some in praise of the Jerusalem of which Mary is the glory while others apply to Mary the glories of Sion, the Lord's dwelling-place, or give thanks to God for the benefits conferred on mankind in the person of Mary. Psalm 23, *Domini est terra,* has its fulfillment in her who became the sanctuary of God. Psalm 44, *Eructavit cor meum,* a marriage hymn celebrating the union of the Messias and His Church, is well applied to Mary, the spouse of the Holy Spirit. Psalm 86, *Fundamenta ejus,* singing of Sion, the mother of all nations, well becomes her who was given, through St. John, to be the mother of us all. Psalm 121, *Laetatus sum,* which invites us to rejoice in the Holy City which is the home of the Lord, is appropriately sung of Mary, who became the actual dwell-

ing-place of the Son of God. And similar examples may be found in the other psalms selected for the office in honor of our Lady.

Passing outside the psalter, the lessons of Matins are from Ecclesiasticus, whose words are most appropriately said of Mary, who in the eternal designs of God was chosen to be the mother of the Word-made-flesh. So she was cultivated as the cedar and the cypress, as the palm-tree and the olive-tree, as the balsam and the myrrh. During Advent, we read as lessons, from the first chapter of St. Luke, the story of the archangel who came with his momentous message to the humble virgin of Nazareth. The little chapters, Scriptural throughout the office, picture Mary as the subject of praise of the daughters of Sion and the queens, or repeat the prophecy of Isaias concerning the flower of Jesse upon whom the Spirit of God would rest. They bid us admire her who comes like the dawn, fair as the moon, bright as the sun, who is "the mother of fair love and of fear and of knowledge and of holy hope."

The antiphons, which introduce and follow the psalms, reiterate the praise of Mary, some repeating verses of the psalms themselves, some echoing texts of the Gospel, and others resounding age-old expressions of the glories of our Lady. Of this third class we have the *Gaude Maria Virgo cunctas haereses sola intermisti in universo mundo* and the *dignare me laudare te,* etc., together with the very familiar *Sub tuum praesidium.* What is said of the antiphons may be predicated of the versicles and responses, of which some are Scriptural, like the oft-said *Diffusa est gratia in labiis tuis* (Psalm 44), and several, traditional, like the *Post partum, Virgo, inviolata permansisti.* The hymns of the Little Office are largely the same examples of Marian poetry which brighten the hours of the Divine Office on feasts of our Lady. We have *Quem terra, pontus, sidera,* ascribed to Fortunatus, which appears in Matins. Lauds gives us *O gloriosa Virginum,* the second part of the same hymn. *Memento rerum Conditor,* the hymn repeated in the four day hours and found again in Compline, is not sung in the Divine Office but is peculiar to this short one. The hymn of Vespers, common to this hour both in the Breviary office and in the little office, is the famous *Ave maris stella,* of medieval composition but not to be credited to St. Bernard nor to Venantius Fortunatus.[8]

[8] Cf. art. "Ave Maris Stella," *Catholic Encyclopaedia,* II.

The orations, recited near the conclusion of each hour, are all favorite liturgical prayers, found elsewhere, in honor of the Blessed Virgin Mary. *Deus qui de beatae* is familiar as a commemoration *de tempore* in the Missal and as the oration of the *Officium S. Mariae in Sabbato* during the period before Feb. 2. *Deus qui salutis aeternae* is equally familiar as a seasonal *commemoratio communis* at Mass as well as being the oration after the *Alma Redemptoris Mater,* from Christmas to the Purification. *Concede nos famulos tuos,* of Vespers of the Little Office, is the oration for feasts of our Lady in the greater office, when the prayer is from the Common. Three other orations, recited in the little office, belong in the category of well-known prayers: *Deus qui virginalem aulam, Concede misericors Deus,* and *Famulorum tuorum.* The very brief *Beatae et gloriosae,* assigned to Compline during the greater part of the year, is proper to the little office.

Of the four concluding anthems of the Blessed Virgin, which this office has in common with the long office, little need be said here. The *Ave Regina* and the *Alma Redemptoris* are of unknown origin but both were popular during the later middle ages. The last-named is referred to by Chaucer in his "Prioress's Tale," in the passage quoted before in this article where the "litel childe" is sitting in the "scole with his prymer." The *Regina coeli* may date from the tenth century but the legend ascribing it to St. Gregory the Great, who heard the opening lines from angels, must be considered apocryphal. The *Salve Regina,* however, is definitely assigned to Hermann Contract (1054), a monk of Reichenau.[9] We have already noted that in the medieval *Prymer,* the little office knows only two of these terminal anthems, the *Salve Regina* and the *Alma Redemptoris.*

Lacking the variety of the canonical hours of the Breviary, this short office of our Lady is adapted for the use of the laity by its more simple structure and the absence of the many complexities which arise in the Divine Office because of the constant conflict between the calendar of fixed feasts and that of the movable ones. The objection of repetitiousness may validly be urged against its daily recitation but this same objection has still greater force against the Litany of Loreto and, even more cogently, the rosary; yet both these devotions maintain their hold on the piety of Catholics. Mid-

[9] Cf. Batiffol, *op. cit.,* p. 172, n.

way between the difficultly-ordered hours of the Breviary and the easily-learned prayers and mysteries of the rosary stands this centuries-old office of our Lady, for clerics and lay-folk alike, a treasured expression of the praises of Mary, in fulfillment of the oft-repeated versicle and response: *Dignare me laudare te Virgo sacrata . . .*

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

CARDINAL CULLEN ON OUR LADY'S INTERCESSION

The dignity and merits of the holy Mother of God cannot but excite us to put great confidence in her intercession, and to have recourse to her prayers in our present wants and necessities, and to implore her assistance for the hour of our death. The holy Virgin was powerful whilst on earth; her charity induced her Son to perform His first miracle, supplying the wants of the guests at the marriage of Cana. Now that she is seated at the right hand of her Son, and crowned with glory; now that she rules as Queen of heaven, her power is still greater, and she will not be less ready to attend to our wants and supplications By her prayers she can obtain whatsoever God can perform by His omnipotence: "Quod Deus imperio, tu Virgo, prece potes." All the graces of heaven descend to us through her hands; she watches over the destinies of the Church of God; she puts to flight heresy and schism—"omnes haereses in universo mundo sola interemisti;" she preserves the faithful from the attacks of the enemy of mankind.

—Paul Cardinal Cullen, in his "Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of Dublin on the Devotions for the Month of May," from *The Pastoral Letters and Other Writings of Cardinal Cullen,* edited by Bishop Moran (Dublin, 1882), III, 363 f. The letter is dated April 27, 1871.

THE BLESSED VIRGIN AND ST. HADRIAN: LITURGICAL BIRTHDAYS

A mother of a family is most anxious to note the annual recurrence of the birthdays of her children and to prepare for them a happy celebration. Holy Mother Church, likewise, is ever watchful to observe the anniversaries of her many sainted children and to commemorate their birthdays in her liturgy. Throughout the ecclesiastical year many liturgical birthdays are celebrated. These annual commemorations are divided into two classes, each having its own proper spirit, and each decidedly different from the other.

The outlook of the Church on her liturgical birthdays, as illustrating these two classes of feasts, is clearly put forth and readily seen in the Mass of Sept. 8. There are ever so many people who realize that Sept. 8 is the feast of the birthday of our Blessed Mother. Perhaps few are aware that it is also the birthday of St. Hadrian who was martyred early in the fourth century.[1] On that day the priest, as mediator between God and man, prays in the name of the entire Church:

> Bestow, we beseech Thee, O Lord, upon Thy servants the gift of heavenly grace. May those for whom the motherhood of the Blessed Virgin has been the beginning of salvation derive an increase of peace on the annual festival of her birthday.

Then, turning his attention to St. Hadrian, the priest adds this Collect:

> Grant, we beg Thee, O Almighty God, that we who celebrate the birthday of Blessed Hadrian, Thy martyr, may by his intercession grow strong in the love of Thy name.

Both are birthday prayers. Yet there is a striking contrast between these two liturgical birthdays. That of the Blessed Virgin celebrates her birth into this life; that of St. Hadrian celebrates his birth into eternal life. The one commemorates the day of birth; the other commemorates the day of death. Yet each one is a liturgical birthday celebration.

In the course of the entire ecclesiastical year there are only three feasts that commemorate the day of birth into this life, namely,

[1] Cf. *Acta S. Adriani* (Acta Sanctorum, Sept. 3 [Paris, 1868], 218-31); S. Salaville, art. "Adrien," *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastiques*, I (1910), 608 ff.

Dec. 25, the birth of Christ; June 24, the birth of St. John the Baptist, and Sept. 8, the birth of the Blessed Virgin Mary. It is important to note that these are the births of three persons who came into this world without sin. Christ was born sinless because of His divinity, Mary because of the privilege of her Immaculate Conception, and St. John because he was sanctified in his mother's womb. All the other birthdays feasts are centered about the day of death.

In ancient Christian times, when the foundations were laid for later liturgical developments, there was evidenced a tendency to look with disdain on the celebration of the day of birth that brought one into this world. Such an outlook is partly explained by the fact of original sin, together with the trials of the present life that flow from it. This was a favorite theme with Origen who states: "Everyone who enters this world is said to be affected with a certain defilement. It is on this account that the Scripture says that no one is free from stain, even if his life shall have been of only one day's duration." [2] Origen further notes that no one among the saints ever held a feast or a banquet on the birth of a son or daughter. Sinners alone, he notes, rejoice over such a birthday. Thus, the Old Testament mentions that Pharaoh the King of Egypt held a celebration; the New Testament records the same of Herod. The Saints, he goes on to say, not only do not hold a celebration on their birthday, but filled with the Holy Spirit they abominate that day.[3] Similarly Pseudo-Origen mentions that our earthly birthday is not a day which we should celebrate, but a day which we should deplore and bewail in so far as it is the beginning of so many trials and sorrows.[4]

At first sight this may seem like deep-rooted pessimism. Yet such is not the case. These Christians were at once realists and optimists, filled with the realistic optimism of Christ. They made light of the day of birth because their attention was focused on the day of death, the true birthday for eternity. Their pagan contemporaries could go about dejected and without hope;[5] they could at

[2] *Homilia 12 in Leviticum*, 4 (*GCS*, VI, 460 Baehrens).

[3] Cf. *Homilia 8 in Leviticum*, 3 (*Ibid.*, 396).

[4] Cf. *In Job*, 3 (*MPG*, XVII, 516).

[5] Cf. *I Thess.*, 4:13.

once fear and curse death because it was the end of all.[6] The Christians, on the contrary, were busy proclaiming their triumphal message that death was not the end, but the beginning, the birth that gave eternal life.[7] This was the birthday they first celebrated in their liturgy.

This is clearly seen in the account of the martyrdom of St. Polycarp, the venerable bishop of Smyrna, who was martyred in the middle of the second century. This account, after stating that his remains were buried in a becoming place, goes on to add: "There the Lord will permit us, as far as possible, to assemble in rapturous joy and celebrate his martyrdom, his birthday—both in order to commemorate the heroes that have gone before, and to train and prepare the heroes yet to come." [8] This sentence, simple though it is, contains a wealth of information. It shows that the Christians looked upon St. Polycarp's death as his birthday, a birthday to be celebrated on the anniversary of his martyrdom, a memorial to be kept in a spirit of rapturous joy.

This outlook on death as a birth is manifested in a very significant change in funeral customs introduced by the early Christians. The pagans were accustomed to hold anniversaries of their dead on the annual recurrence of the birthday of the deceased. The Christians, desirous to show their separation from paganism, celebrated their memorials on the day of death.[9] This change was rooted in their conviction that death was the true birthday; and Christian writers are at pains to emphasize this very strongly. Tertullian expressly mentions: "We offer sacrifice for the dead on the anniversary of their death, instead of on their birthdays." [10] St. Ambrose reminds his congregation that Christians disregard the birthday of the de-

[6] Cf. F. Dölger, *Die Sonne der Gerechtigkeit und der Schwarze* (Münster, 1919), pp. 80 ff.

[7] Cf. A. C. Rush, *Death and Burial in Christian Antiquity* (Washington, D. C., 1941), pp. 72-87.

[8] *Martyrium Polycarpi*, 18, 3=F. Funk-K. Bihlmeyer, *Die apostolischen Väter* (Tübingen, 1924), p. 130; J. Kleist, *The Didache*, etc. (Ancient Christian Writers, VI [Westminster, Md. 1948]), 99, 203.

[9] Cf. F. Dölger ΙΧΘΥΣ *Der heilige Fisch in den antiken Religionen und im Christentum*, II (Münster, 1922), 383, 549 f., 564; L. Ruland, *Die Geschichte der kirchlichen Leichenfeier* (Regensburg, 1901), p. 88.

[10] *De corona militis*, 3 (1. 422 Oehler).

ceased and renew their solemn memorial on the day of their death.[11] These are mere statements of fact. Pseudo-Origen brings out clearly the relation between the Christian belief in death as a birth and the custom of celebrating the day of death instead of the day of birth in these words:

> Let us take note, o men, of the great change that has come over mankind. For the ancients, loving this one life and not hoping for another after the present life, were accustomed to celebrate the day of birth. Now, however, we do not celebrate the day of birth, because it is the entrance to sorrows and trials, but we celebrate the day of death as the setting aside of all sorrows and the release from all trials. We celebrate the day of death because those who seem to die do not die. . . On this account, therefore, we do not celebrate the day of birth because those who die are living forever.[12]

The Christian practice, therefore, was to celebrate the anniversary of the martyr not on the day of his birth but on day of his death. However, there is ingrained in the heart of man a natural craving for a birthday celebration. This the Christians would not reject altogether. They would continue to have birthday celebrations, carried out in a mystical manner in their liturgy, by centering their thoughts on the fact that martyrdom was the saint's birthday for heaven.[13] This has a very important bearing on the liturgy for it is from this practice that we have the most ancient of feasts, namely, the anniversaries of the martyrs or their liturgical birthdays. At first these commemorations were local festivals proper to the community where the martyr lived and died. It was only natural that each church should have a special devotion towards its own martyred saints who were the admiration of the early Christians as being the most perfect imitators of Christ. Gradually the practice spread of one church adopting the commemorations of another local community and in this way certain saints acquired almost universal veneration.[14]

[11] Cf. *De excessu Satyri*, 2, 5 (*MPL, XVI*, 1316).

[12] *In Job*, 3 (*MPG*, XVII, 517).

[13] Cf. F. Dölger, *Sol Salutis. Gebet und Gesang im christlichem Altertum* (Münster, 1925), p. 146 n.

[14] Cf. L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship, its Origin and Development* (London, 1927), pp. 283 f.; Delehaye, H., *Les origines du culte des martyrs* (Brussels, 1933).

This Christian practice of celebrating the anniversaries of the deaths of the martyrs as their birthdays for heaven was a custom of long standing when liturgical feasts centering about the actual day of birth were introduced. At the very institution of such feasts it was a recognized principle that the Church would not commemorate the birthday of just any ordinary Christian, not even of great Saints even though they were Apostles. For the introduction of a feast commemorating the day of birth into this life it was taken for granted that there had to be something extraordinarily sacred about that birth. It had to be a birth in which there was clearly manifest some miraculous intervention on the part of God. It had to be the birth of one who played a great role in the economy of God's plan of redeeming mankind through Christ, the Word made flesh. In fact, the birth itself had to be instrumental in preparing the way for the temporal birth and mission of the Son of God.

It was only normal that in time the birth of St. John the Baptist should be celebrated. It was of him that Christ said: "Among those born of women there has not risen a greater than John the Baptist." [15] It was of him that the angel said that he shall be great before the Lord, that he shall be filled with the Holy Spirit even from his mother's womb, and that he shall bring back to the Lord their God many of the children of Israel.[16] The angel himself proclaimed that many would rejoice in his birth,[17] and it was only normal that the Church should join in this rejoicing by instituting a special feast commemorating his birthday.[18]

The sermons of St. Augustine on St. John the Baptist are important not only for helping to propagate the feast of his birth which, as he admits, was something handed down in the Church,[19] but they are also important for the insight they give into the attitude of the Church on birthday celebrations in the liturgy. Augustine paves the way by reminding his hearers that this is the feast not of

[15] *Matt.* 11:11.

[16] Cf. *Luke* 1:15-17.

[17] Cf. *Luke* 1:14.

[18] Cf. L. Duchesne, *op. cit.*, p. 270; A. Butler-H. Thurston, *The Lives of the Saints,* VI (New York, 1937), p. 319.

[19] Cf. *Sermo 292,* 1 (*MPL,* XXXVIII, 1320); G. Morin, "La date de le Saint Jean," *Revue Benedictine,* V (1888), 257-64; H. Leclercq, "Saint Jean-Baptiste," *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie,* VII (1927), 2171.

St. John the Evangelist but of St. John the Baptist. Furthermore he stresses that this is the feast not of his death but of his birth.[20]

St. John the Baptist was unique in having a feast to commemorate his birth. Yet nothing was more fitting than that a feast should be instituted. Such a feast, Augustine points out, was meant to keep alive in the hearts of the faithful the memory of the blessings of God and the great works of the Most High in having the precursor of the Lord born in a wonderful way before the Great Wonder Who was to come.[21] The birth of John is celebrated because his birth, like that of Christ, is full of mysteries.[22] Recalling the blessings of God and the great works of the Most High that made the birth of John, like that of Christ, a great mystery, Augustine points out that both were announced by an angel. It was a barren woman and a man advanced in age who begot John; a virgin without the co-operation of man begot Christ. The God-Man Who was to be born of a virgin was preceded in time by the wonderful man who was born of a barren woman. In the case of the mother of John barrenness blossomed into fertility; in the case of the Mother of Christ fertility did not destroy virginal integrity.[23]

St. Augustine seems beyond himself in his effort to portray adequately the privilege of St. John the Baptist in having a feast to commemorate his birth. Such a feast gave him a distinction that no prophet or apostles enjoyed. This put him in a class with Christ whose birth the Church celebrated. Hence Augustine says: "The Church has not celebrated the birthday of any of the prophets, patriarchs, or apostles. Only two birthdays does it celebrate, namely, that of John and that of Christ." [24] The birthday of Christ, however, was a feast of one who was God and man; the birthday of John, on the other hand, was the feast of one who was merely man.

[20] Cf. *Sermones* 290, 1; 292, 1 (*MPL*, XXXVIII, 1312-1320). It is interesting to note the pains that the Hieronymian Martyrology takes to leave no doubt that this birthday is the earthly birthday of John. Cf. H. Quentin-H. Delehaye, *Martyrologium Hieronymianum* (Acta Sanctorum, Nov. 2.2 [Brussels, 1931], 333). Cf. *Sermo* 380, 1 (*MPL*, XXXIX 1675).

[21] Cf. *Sermo* 288, 1 (*MPL*, XXXVIII 1302).

[22] Cf. *Sermones* 289, 5; 290, 2 (*MPL*, XXXVIII 1311, 1313).

[23] Cf. *Sermones* 287, 3; 288, 1; 289, 1; 290, 1-2; 291, 1; 293, 1 (*MPL*, XXXVIII, 1301, 1302, 1308, 1312-13; 1316, 1317).

[24] *Sermo* 287, 1 (*MPL*, XXXVIII, 1301). Cf. *Sermo* 293, 1 (*MPL*, XXXVIII, 1327).

John was the only saint whose birthday at that time the Church celebrated. Stressing this to the fullest measure, Augustine challenges: "Excepting John, name me one other servant among the patriarchs, prophets, or apostles whose birthday the Church celebrates. True, we celebrate the martyrdom of many servants but the birthday of no one but John." [25]

Taking up the problem why the birth of John is celebrated in preference to the births of the apostles, martyrs, prophets, and patriarchs, Augustine points out the definite relationship between the birth of John and that of Christ. The apostles, after being born and attaining to manhood in the course of time, were called to the discipleship. It was only later in life that their faith bound them to Christ. However, the birth of none of them served the cause of the Lord. In regard to the prophets and patriarchs, it was only after they were born and grew in age that they were filled with the Holy Spirit and prophesied about Christ. They were born to prophesy later on. However the very birth of John proclaimed Christ the Lord because from out of the womb John greeted the Lord as having already been conceived.[26]

Augustine has formulated the practice of the Church in his remark that the Church celebrates the death of many of its servants, but the birthday of no one but John. Furthermore, he has expatiated at great length on the reason why the celebration of a birthday should find its way into the liturgy. It is from Pseudo-Augustine that we have a fine summation of the attitude of the Church on birthday celebrations. In a sermon on St. John the Baptist, he states:

> Aside from the most sacred birth of Christ we read that no one's birthday is celebrated except that of John the Baptist. In the other saints and elect of God we know that that day is celebrated on which, after finishing their labors and triumphantly overcoming the world, the present life gave them birth to an undying eternity. In other

[25] *Sermo* 290, 2 (*MPL*, XXXVIII, 1313). Cf. Caesarius of Arles, *Sermones* 216-17=G. Morin, *Sancti Caesarii Arelatensis Sermones* 1. 1 (Maredsous, 1937), 814-19.

[26] Cf. *Sermo* 292, 1 (*MPL*, XXXVIII, 1320). Similar ideas on St. John the Baptist are found in sermons which later scholarship has shown to be those of Augustine. Cf. G. Morin, *S. Augustine Sermones post Maurinos reperti* (Rome, 1930), pp. 223-226, 227-231, 351-352.

saints the complete merits of the last day are celebrated; in the case of John the Baptist the first day, in fact the very beginning of human life is set aside as something holy.[27]

Thus it is that very early in the history of the Church the foundation was laid for future development of liturgical birthday feasts. It was then definitely established that there were but two classes of such feasts, those celebrating the day of birth and those commemorating the day of death. Of the feasts recalling the day of birth only one more was to be added, namely, that of the Blessed Virgin. Although the beginnings of this feast of Eastern origin are somewhat obscure,[28] we know that it was solemnly celebrated at Rome by Sergius, a Pope of Syrian origin, towards the end of the seventh century.[29] This is the feast of a birth that was holy and sinless, of a birth, the miraculous nature of which was prophesied long in advance by Isaias. This is the feast of a birth which was most intimately linked up with the plan of God in redeeming the world through Christ. The joy over the birth of Mary, the Mother of God, is the theme of the liturgy on this day, for the Church exultingly exclaims: "Thy birth, O Virgin Mother of God, proclaimed joy to the whole world. Out of thee there arose the Sun of Justice, Christ Our Lord." [30] Mary's feast was and is the last feast to commemorate a birth into this life. All other feasts commemorate not the day of birth, but the holiness of the saint and the perfected sanctity of his last day that begot him for eternal life.

It has well been said that prayer is an external manifestation of belief. These liturgical gatherings of the early Church stressed the Christian belief that death is the birth for eternal life. Ecclesiastical writers in their anniversary panegyrics on the martyrs were insistent in reminding their hearers that death is nothing but a passage from life to life, a process of being transferred to true life, a setting out to a better life, even to eternal life.[31] This was not

[27] *Sermo* 196, 1 (*MPL*, XXXIX, 2111).

[28] Cf. F. Holweck, "Nativity of the Blessed Virgin," *Catholic Encyclopedia*, X (1911), 712; H. Dausend, "Marienfeste," *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, VI (1934), 936; L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 272.

[29] Cf. L. Duchesne, *Liber pontificalis*, I (Paris, 1886), 376, 381; E. Amann, "Serge," *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, XIV, 2 (Paris, 1941), 1916.

[30] *Brevarium Romanum*, Res. 6 ad Matutinas.

[31] Cf. A. C. Rush, *Death and Burial in Christian Antiquity*, p. 84.

mere theoretical preaching, but a lesson that was grasped by the rank and file of Christians who, thrilled with this triumphant message, in all confidence and truth inscribed on the tombs of their loved ones: "Born into eternity." [32]

Liturgy is a crystallization of Catholic faith, a codification of Christian beliefs and outlooks, a depository of ecclesiastical practices and culture. Liturgy is a vital link uniting the Church in the modern world with that of the earliest times. Today in the twentieth century the Church in her liturgical commemoration of the saints teaches the lesson that Christian death is not the end of all but the birthday for eternal life. In these feasts the Church reminds her children that they are followers of Him who having died once now lives,[33] who, as the first born of the death, was begotten to a new life by His resurrection,[34] and who expressly stated: "I am the Resurrection and the Life; he who believes in Me, even if he dies shall live, and whosoever lives and believes in Me shall never die." [35]

ALFRED C. RUSH, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[32] Cf. *Ibid.* 81.
[33] Cf. *Rom.* 6:10.
[34] Cf. *Col.* 1:18.
[35] *John* 11:25-26.

CHRIST OUR HOPE

As these evils crowd in upon us, what hope of remedy is left to us except that which comes from Christ,from His inspirations and from His teaching, a healing stream flowing through every vein of our society? Only Christ's law, only Christ's grace, can renew and restore private and public life, redressing the true balance of rights and duties, checking unbridled self-interest, controlling passion, implementing and perfecting the course of strict justice with His overflowing charity.

—Pope Pius XII in his Easter broadcast in 1940.

PONTIFICAL VESTMENTS AND EXCEPTIONS

The April, 1949, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* published an article on the merits of H. J. McCloud's recent book *Clerical Dress and Insignia of the Roman Catholic Church,* dealing with the ecclesiastical vestments called *pontificalia.* The article also mentions Barbier de Montault's *Les costumes et les usages ecclésiastiques* and the splendid book *Costume of Prelates* by J. A. Nainfa, S.S.

The prescribed uniformity of the hierarchic vestments goes parallel with the dogmatic and canonical universality of the Church. The official costumes of prelates denoting their rank; the form, design, color, etc., of these costumes are strictly governed by the precise rules and prescriptions of the Congregation of the Rites and the Congregation of the Ceremonial. Still, as any humanly established rules and regulations, these centrally controlled directives are subject to that ancient rule: *Exceptio firmat regulam.* Historic privileges, tradition, and firmly rooted local customs produced notable exceptions not mentioned in the three books listed above. The purpose of this paper is to examine certain of the more interesting of these exceptions. (The City of Rome is not included in our study.)

COLOR

The highest ranking ecclesiastical dignitaries beneath the Pope are the Cardinals. Their vestments, with the specifically reserved color, are designated to show the august rank of those Princes of the Church. One would naturally think that the scarlet red hat, biretta and skull cap, stockings, cassock and mozzetta, cloak, cincture and red morocco shoes or black shoes bordered with red are distinctively those of a Cardinal, a member of the Sacred College. Far from it. The Archbishop of Salzburg and the Archbishop of Pisa both have the privilege of wearing the Cardinalatial red robes. The Archbishop of Prague likewise can wear a Cardinal's robes, including the biretta. The Archbishop of Gnesen-Posen, now in Poland, also wears the Cardinal's robes but not the hat. His geographical neighbor, the Archbishop of Mohilev, Russia, is also entitled to wear a Cardinal's robes, calotte included.

And even though the red color is preserved for Cardinals only,

the Titular Canons of the Cathedral Chapter in Nevers, France, wear a red cassock on solemn feast days. In the old Papal city of Avignon the Canons of the Cathedral Chapter wear a Cappa of red wool when in Choir, while outside they don a black cloak with ermine border symbolic of the Cardinalate and Royalty combined.

As for the bishops, the official color of their clothes is purple. Yet, the Cappa of the Canons of the Primatial Chapter in Lyons, France, is of the same episcopal purple. In Lourdes, France, the chaplains of the Basilica of the Blessed Virgin have their rochet and black silk mozzetta trimmed with purple and with buttons of the same hue. In Majorca, Balearic Islands, the Titular Canons wear black cassocks with purple buttons and braid; the cord of their hats, the collar, cincture, and stockings are also of the same purple tone any bishop could and would wear.

To add the final touch of this hierarchical color scheme: the mozzetta of the Titular Canons and Vicars-General in Poitiers, France, is violet, of the penitential hue.

PALLIUM

Another interesting series of exceptions concerns the Pallium. This ecclesiastic vestment is generally connected with the jurisdictional power of a Metropolitan. Pallium and Metropolitan Archbishop are inseparable terms in the minds of the people. Yet, the Bishops of Clermont-Ferrand, Constances, Le-Puy, Marseilles and Verdun, all in France, the German Bishops of Ermland (now Russia), Regensburg and Würzburg, and the Hungarian Bishops of Pecs and Vac have the right to the Pallium granted to them *in perpetuum*. The Archbishop of Cuyaba, Brazil, in 1915 received the Pallium as a personal privilege, while the Bishop of Ghent, Belgium, also of 1915, received the privilege of Pallium for his own person only (*ad personam*). In contrast to that, the Patriarch of the West Indies cannot wear a Pallium, as his Patriarchate is purely an honorary one and carries with it no episcopal jurisdiction since no diocese is attached to it.

RATIONALE

The third, and really rare curiosity in ecclesiastical vestments is somehow omitted from the recent Church vestments books. We mean the "Rationale," or "Superhumerale," this episcopal counterpart to the Archiepiscopal Pallium, a sort of pallium covered with

precious stones and worn over the chasuble like the Pallium. This richly ornamented vestment was widely used in the middle ages from the tenth century on. At present, only four bishops wear this pontifical adornment, namely, the German Bishops of Eichstätt and Paderborn, the Polish Prince-Bishop of Cracow, and the French Bishop of Nancy who inherited his right from the Bishops of Toul. (Toul diocese was suppressed in 1802.)

MITRE

The Mitre is the functional headwear of Cardinals, Archbishops, Bishops, Abbots and Protonotaries Apostolic. But in Benevento, Italy, when the Archbishop says the Mass, the sixteen Canons of the Metropolitan Chapter wear mitres with their Cappa Magna and impress one as if sixteen bishops were sitting in the spacious sanctuary of the church. (Here and in the following, we do not deal with Canons whose offices carry the dignity of the Protonotary Apostolic Supernumerary *durante munere* as in Florence, Padua, Udine and Venice of Italy, and in Esztergom of Hungary; neither do we deal with Canons, Domprobsts and Dompfarrers who are Titular Abbots or Provosts as in Germany, Austria and Hungary. Even diocesan Bishops' titles are sometimes united with some abbey's name. The bishop of Sabina, Italy, is always also the Abbot of Farfa, *in perpetuum.*)

In Spain, the Priors of the Collegiate Chapters in Borja and Calatajud were mitred. In Linz, Austria, the Chapter's Provost is mitred, as is the Archpriest of the Chapter of Monza (Royal Basilica) in Milan. In Lavant, Styria, Austria, both the Provost and the Dean of the Chapter wear their mitres on solemn occasions.

Special mention must be given here to the nearly ninety Canons of the already mentioned Primatial Chapter in Lyons, France. Before the Revolution, the French King was the Premier Canon of the Chapter. All the Canons bore the title of count and wore mitres. Even today, the Canons have the perpetual privilege of the mitre and the right to the episcopal purple Cappa.

Unique is the case in the Tyrolese diocese of Brixen, now Bressanone, Italy, where the parish church dedicated to the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin-Mother was raised to the dignity of a mitred abbey, on April 27, 1915. The mitred parish priest-abbot can

pontificate in his own parish church only and in the Church of St. Pancratius on the feast of this saint.

A very interesting custom at Monte Cassino also deserves to be mentioned here. When the Abbot of Monte Cassino celebrates a pontifical Mass, he uses seven different precious mitres in succession. This custom symbolizes the seven ancient dioceses which were united in the present Diocese of Monte Cassino.

ARCHIEPISCOPAL CROSS

Like the Pallium, the double-armed, so-called "Archiepiscopal Cross" also is the proper insigne of a Metropolitan Archbishop. Here again we meet three exceptions. The Bishop of Ermland, East Prussia, now Russia, and the Bishop of Guadeloupe or Basse-Terre, French Antilles, have the privilege of having the Archiepiscopal Cross borne before them, and the Hungarian Bishop of Pecs has the same privilege of the Archiepiscopal Cross except in the presence of a Cardinal.

It is worth while to mention here that the King of Hungary also had the right to the double-armed Archiepiscopal Cross. This privilege was given to the first Hungarian King, St. Stephen, by Pope Sylvester II in the year 1000, together with the title "Apostolic King of Hungary." The double-armed Apostolic Cross was carried before the King of Hungary on solemn occasions. This same Archiepiscopal Cross is visible in the left field of the official coat-of-arms of Hungary, a golden double cross in red field, standing on the central crowned green hill higher than the two green side hills.

MISCELLANEA

Heraldry also plays its part in the prelates' insignia. The Tiara with the keys is the symbol of the Pope. Yet, this same Tiara without the keys is in the coat-of-arms of the Patriarch of Lisbon, Portugal, with no documental proof for authorization. The arms of the Archbishop of Benevento, Italy, has a Tiara of one crown only. Would it be out of place to mention here that the Dean of the Graeco-Latin Collegiate Chapter in Messian, Italy, is called "Protopope"?

Civic honors and military titles do not enter our field of *pontificalia*. But for curiosity's sake it might be of interest to mention that the Bishop of Malta is *ipso facto* a Brigadier-General in the

British Army and that the Patriarch of the West Indies is Chaplain Major of the Spanish Army. Painfully cruel is the contrast between the title and the present condition of the imprisoned Cardinal Mindszenty: the Prince-Primate of Hungary, always the Archbishop of Esztegom, is automatically "The First Citizen of the Nation."

The offered list of exceptions is not complete, by any means. There are other interesting exceptions to the general rules. For example, there is a diocese somewhere in Europe where the present writer has seen six Canons reciting their breviary in the sanctuary of the cathedral and wearing green mozzettas, the green being "the true episcopal color" (green hat, green hat-cordon, green lining of the hat, green drapery over the Bishop's throne, green cover for the Bishop's *prie-dieu,* green canopy over his coat-of-arms, etc.). Alas, two wars, two revolutions and the myriad new impressions gained in this land of America have washed away the already faded memory of that place and country.

BLAISE HOSPODAR

Our Lady of the Lake College
San Antonio, Texas

NO OTHER FOUNDATION

It may be said in all truth that the Church, like Christ, goes through the centuries doing good to all. There would be today neither Socialism nor Communism if the rulers of the nations had not scorned the teachings and maternal warnings of the Church. On the bases of liberalism and laicism they wished to build other social edifices which, powerful and imposing as they seemed at first, all too soon revealed the weakness of their foundations, and today are crumbling one after another before our eyes, as everything must crumble that is not grounded on the one corner stone which is Christ Jesus.

—Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical *Divini Redemptoris,* issued March 19, 1937.

MISSION INTENTION

The Mission Intention for the month of August, 1949, is "Charity among the Nations and Peoples of the East."

EPISCOPACY AND PRIESTHOOD ACCORDING TO ST. THOMAS

The recent faculties for Confirmation granted to pastors by the Holy Father invite once more the old question: "Is the Episcopacy an 'order' essentially distinct from the presbyter-order, or is the Episcopacy the complement of the presbyter-order?"

St. Thomas answered the question in his own way; yet some preliminaries seem necessary before attempting to explain his answer. The present position is briefly summed up by Fr. Prümmer O.P., who writes:

> Most of the old scholastics, including St. Thomas, reply that it is not; and Raymond Cardinal Capischi O.P. mentions eighty authors (almost all of whom he personally professes to have read), all of whom say that the Episcopacy is not a completely distinct sacrament. Several of the old and nearly all modern theologians, however, teach that the Episcopacy is an entirely distinct order and sacrament, and consequently reckon that there are not seven but eight orders.[1]

It is interesting to note that Cardinal Capischi's *Controversiae theol.* appeared in Rome in 1670 (106 years after the termination of Trent). At that time the teaching of Trent must have been much in the ascendant, yet there is no hint that the scholastic view was considered unorthodox.

The Council of Trent anathematises all who say that: (1) besides the priesthood there are no *other orders* in the Catholic Church, no major or minor orders by which as by certain grades one advances to the priesthood; (2) order or *sacred* ordination is not really and truly a sacrament; and (3) in the Catholic Church there is not a hierarchy by *divine* ordination and institution which consists of bishops, priests, and ministers.[2]

Italics were inserted above to draw attention to the fact that in the canons dealing with true and proper sacrament-order[3] Trent uses the expression *"sacred* ordination" (*sacram ordinationem*), but omits it in the succeeding canons concerning hierarchy and

[1] *Theologia moralis*, III, n. 587.

[2] *DB*, 962, 963, 966.

[3] To avoid confusion, "sacrament-order" and "sacrament-character" will be used whenever there is reference to an order which is a true and proper sacrament.

substitutes instead the words "by divine ordination" (*divina ordinatione*). This seems to suggest that there must be some good reason for the distinction; and that there are two kinds of order, the hierarchical-order and the sacrament-order. Speaking expressly of *ecclesiasticos gradus,* the Council mentions bishops as the successors of the Apostles and as exaltedly belonging to the hierarchical order (*ad hunc hierarchicum ordinem praecipue pertinere*). It then goes on to say: "These are superior to priests, and of themselves can give the Sacrament of Confirmation, ordain ministers of the Church, and perform very many other things, for the discharge of which others, of inferior grade, have no power." [4] Here no express mention of *sacerdotium* is found; hence it seems that the whole treatment here is concerned with the hierarchical-order. It is therefore *de fide* that Bishops are *hierarchically* superior to the *presbyteri* or ordinary priests; but there is no definition that the sacrament-order of a bishop is superior to the sacrament-order of a priest.

Ambiguity clings to each of these words; therefore some explanation seems imperative.

The *Catechism of the Council of Trent* says that "The office of a priest . . . is to offer Sacrifice to God and to administer the Sacraments of the Church"; and again, ". . . although (the sacerdotal order) is one alone, yet it has various degrees of dignity and power. The first degree is that of those who are simply called priests. . . . The second is that of Bishops . . ." [5] Obviously the term, *sacerdotium,* may refer to a priest or to a bishop; hence the difficulty of of arguing *ad rem* from the Tridentine statement anathematizing those who say that: "besides the priesthood (*sacerdotium*) there are no other orders in the Catholic Church . . ."

This word has many meanings. Its present application concerns only the sacraments connected with the office of bishop and priest. *Sacramentum ordinis* is an ambiguous expression; it may mean an order which is itself a sacrament; or it may mean a sacred office or *potestas* for the valid administration of certain sacraments. It is well, therefore, to distinguish *sacramentum ordinis* into "sacrament-order" and "hierarchical-order."

[4] *DB,* 960.

[5] *The Catechism of the Council of Trent for Parish Priests,* tr. John A. McHugh O.P. and Charles J. Callan O.P. (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., 1943), pp. 331, 332.

Sacrament-order is a consecration which gives a sacred office, a sacrament-character, and is itself a true and proper sacrament. A hierarchical-order is a consecration which makes the recipient one with some divinely instituted office for the valid administration of certain sacraments, but which does not give a sacrament-character, and is not itself a sacrament. Both definitions refer to the ritual ceremony which irrevocably makes the recipient one with the *office;* nor is it possible to be irrevocably one with any such office save by proper consecration. At times not the ritual ceremony but the office itself is spoken of, e.g., the episcopal-order or the sacerdotal-order. This may be confusing if the precise meaning is not carefully determined.

It is well to note that the hierarchical-order always presupposes that the aspirant thereto already possesses the necessary sacrament-order; and that, the more sacraments a hierarchical-order is able validly to confer, the higher the hierarchical-order. The special function of the hierarchical-order or *potestas* seems to be its ability to call the sacrament-character into valid act. From this it follows that it is not the sacrament-character nor its exercise which gives hierarchical-order to its possessor. Although an ordinary priest exercises the highest sacrament-character in consecrating the Holy Eucharist, yet such exercise gives him neither his own priestly hierarchical-order nor any other. Hence an ordinary priest cannot give any sacraments other than those for which he is empowered by his own hierarchical-order as *sacerdos simplex.*

The *Codex juris* declares that the hierarchy of jurisdiction consists of the Supreme Pontificate and the subordinate episcopate; that the Pope obtains jurisdiction, *jure divino,* when, after due election, he accepts his supreme office; and that all others receive jurisdiction by canonical mission.[6]

Observe that the Supreme Pontificate is not a *sacramentum ordinis* and so requires no consecration for its valid possession. A Pope may freely resign and relinquish his office. Jurisdiction as regards others is regulated by canon 118: "Soli clerici possunt potestatem sive ordinis sive jurisdictionis ecclesiasticae . . . obtinere." Considering this canon, and the common view that a Pope who is not a bishop cannot validly ordain priests, it does seem that there is an intimate relation between jurisdiction and hierarchical-order.

[6] Cf. canons 108, 109.

The power in the Church is two-fold: of order and of jurisdiction. Let order stand for sacrament-order or special spiritual ability bestowed by the sacrament; and as this is always required for hierarchical-order or *potestas,* let attention center principally on hierarchical-*potestas.* Is it conceivable that a minister can give a valid sacrament to a person who in no manner whatsoever comes under his sway? It is known that a priest or bishop cannot validly forgive sin without "canonical mission" jurisdiction, which makes the penitent his subject. Yet a priest cut off from the Church can validly confer Extreme Unction, and a bishop cut off from the Church can validly confirm and ordain; and yet confessedly these have no "canonical-mission" jurisdiction. Why?. The answer is that besides the required sacrament-character these have also the necessary hierarchical-order or power. It does seem, therefore, that that hierarchical-order really bestows some kind of jurisdiction; and that such jurisdiction is not sufficient for the Sacrament of Penance. One may, therefore, be permitted to introduce a distinction, and to divide jurisdiction into *immediate* and *mediate* jurisdiction.

Immediate jurisdiction is that which comes directly from Christ to a person who holds a divine office: either the Supreme Pontificate by legitimate election and acceptance, or a hierarchical-order or *potestas* by due consecration. All other jurisdiction (spiritual) is mediate. Immediate jurisdiction belongs to the priest and bishop only for sacraments which are divinely allotted to their respective hierarchical-orders or *potestates.* Immediate jurisdiction, as regards its validity, being directly from Christ, is *ex natura sua* always supreme and includes under its sway every wayfarer who is *homo capax* of its sacraments. Though the Pope can legislate for its licit use, he cannot annul it or prevent its valid action.

THE TEACHING OF ST. THOMAS

St. Thomas builds his teaching on the general principle that "the distinction of orders is derived from their relation to the Eucharist. For the power of order is directed either to the consecration of the Eucharist itself, or to some ministry in connection with the sacrament of the Eucharist." [7]

This division of orders is a division of a "potestative whole." The entire fullness of the sacrament is in one order, namely, in the

[7] *Sum. theol., Supp.,* q. 37, a. 2.

priesthood (*sacerdotio*).[8] By *sacerdotio* St. Thomas means here the sacrament-order of the *simplex-sacerdos*. Hence from the point of view of sacrament-order, Pope, bishop, and priest are all equal. They seem equal also in the essential spiritual power required for all blessings and consecrations, though not equal in the immediate jurisdiction or authority which is necessary to call that power into valid act.

Wherein, therefore, is a bishop superior to a priest?

St. Thomas replies: in his episcopal-order or *potestas;* or, as the Council of Trent afterwards said, by his episcopal-order *divina ordinatione instituto*. Having remarked that a person devoid of the use of reason and of the sacerdotal sacrament-order cannot be consecrated bishop, St. Thomas explains:

> Order may be understood in two ways. In one way as a sacrament, and thus . . . it is directed to the Eucharist-sacrament. Now since the bishop has here no higher power than the priest, in this respect the episcopate is not an order. In another way order may be deemed an office in relation to certain sacred actions: and then, since in hierarchical actions a bishop has as regards the Mystical Body a power higher than a priest, the episcopate is an order.[9]

Thus, according to St. Thomas, the common or usual meaning of *episcopatus* is not sacrament-order, but hierarchical office to which pertain "certain sacred actions."

Here, then, a clear distinction is drawn between sacrament-order and hierarchical-order, office, or *potestas*. It will be noted, however, that the episcopate is expressly set down as *not* a sacrament. Why? Because (1) it cannot be received unless the aspirant already possesses the sacerdotal sacrament-character—if it were a sacrament, baptism alone would suffice for its valid reception; (2) it gives no superior power for consecrating the Holy Eucharist; and (3) it gives no sacrament-character: "When promoted to the episcopate one receives power which abides in him forever, although it cannot be called a character, because a person is not thereby ordained directly to God, but to Christ's Mystical Body. Still, like a character, it remains indelibly, because it is imparted through consecration." [10]

St. Thomas taught that consecration made the consecrated irre-

[8] Cf. *ibid.*, q. 37, a. 1, *ad* 2.

[9] *Ibid.*, q. 40, a. 5.

[10] *Ibid.*, q. 38, a. 2, *ad* 2.

vocably one with his office. Thus, because he held that "solemnitas . . . voti consistit in quadam consecratione," he taught that a solemn vow could not be dispensed, and that no prelate could effect that "homo Deo consecratus quamdiu vivit, consecratus esse desistat." [11] Once duly consecrated, a bishop remains a bishop forever. But there could be no valid consecration unless the aspirant was a priest; in other words, no priest, no bishop.

Is the episcopal *potestas* simply jurisdiction? St. Thomas answers: "A bishop's power is not merely a power of jurisdiction but also a power of order . . . taking order as it is generally understood." [12] He therefore considered the episcopal *potestas* not "canonical mission" jurisdiction, but immediate jurisdiction received directly from Christ. St. Thomas compares the episcopal *potestas* to a political power, the duty of which is to supply subjects with their proper qualifications for office and other things; in like manner, the function of the episcopal-order is to give Holy Orders, to consecrate, to confirm, etc. Briefly, then, the *episcopatus* is not a sacrament and does not impress a sacrament-character; it does, however, confer a hierarchical-order character, or *potestas,* which enables the bishop (where mediate jurisdiction is not required) to call into valid act the whole efficiency of a priest's sacrament-order; and on that account the *episcopatus* may justly be called the *complementum presbyteratus.*

Next comes the question, can the Pope supply for the episcopal-*potestas* and delegate a *simplex sacerdos* to confer validly all sacraments of which a bishop is the ordinary minister? Theologians give no unanimous solution, but perhaps most follow St. Thomas, who replies:

> The Pope, who has the fullness of episcopal (*pontificalis*) power can entrust one who is not a bishop with things pertaining to the episcopal diginity, provided they bear no immediate relation to the true Body of Christ. Hence by virtue of his commission a simple priest can confer minor orders and confirm; but not one who is not a priest. Nor can a priest confer the higher orders which bear an immediate relation to Christ's Body, over the consecration of which the Pope has no greater power than a simple priest.[13]

St. Thomas, therefore, distinguishes between sacraments which

[11] *Sum. theol.,* II-II, q. 88, a. 1.

[12] *Sum. theol., Supp.,* q. 40, a. 5, *ad* 3.

[13] *Ibid.,* q. 38, a. 1, *ad* 3.

relate immediately to the members of the Mystical Body of Christ and those which relate to His Real Body. Over the Mystical Body the Pope has, directly from Christ, full pontifical jurisdiction. He can, consequently, supply jurisdiction for the valid exercise of sacrament-orders as regards all sacraments which immediately concern members of the Mystical Body; and *a fortiori,* it seems, for all similar consecrations. But over Christ Himself or over Christ's Real Body the Pope has no pontifical jurisdiction. He cannot, therefore, delegate jurisdiction for sacraments which relate immediately to the Real Body of Christ. For such sacraments jurisdiction comes only from the hierarchical-order or *potestas;* here, then, the Papal *potestas* is just the same as that of an ordinary priest or bishop.

To the objection that Confirmation relates immediately to the Real Body of Christ, and yet the Pope delegates for this sacrament, the Thomistic answer would be that Confirmation gives no *officium operandi* but only an increased *potestas suscipiendi* with regard to the Real Body of Christ—of receiving grace to be not only a real Christian but also a real soldier of Christ.[14] Orders concern acts which relate to "conficiendum vel administrandum Verum Christi Corpus." According to St. Thomas, the Pope has full power to delegate a priest for the valid conferring of Confirmation, of consecrations, and of all sacraments which relate immediately to the Mystical Body of Christ; but he has no power to delegate a priest to give sacrament-orders that relate immediately to the Real Body of Christ. Strangely enough, it seems to follow from this principle that although the Pope cannot delegate a priest for the valid ordination of a priest, yet he can delegate a priest for the valid consecration of a bishop.

Further, one must also conclude that the above-mentioned Papal delegation proceeds from the plenitude of the Pope's pontifical jurisdiction, and not from his episcopal-order or *potestas.* From its very nature episcopal-order cannot, it seems, delegate itself or be acquired by delegation. It can be acquired only by due consecration. Clearly, therefore, no ordinary bishop can delegate a priest to give Confirmation.

To sum up. The Pope-bishop has the fulllness on earth of all spiritual power—the fullness of the *sacramentum ordinis* and of divine jurisdiction. Strictly, therefore, the Pope alone possesses

[14] *Cf. ibid.,* q. 37, a. 5, *ad* 1.

the entire "plenitude of the priesthood." Next to him comes the ordinary bishop, who, by his hierarchical-order or *potestas* is in the highest grade of the *sacramentum ordinis,* for, as St. Thomas says: "The power of the ministers resides in the bishop as their source, but not in the priest, for he does not confer those orders." [15]

It is clear, therefore, that although St. Thomas holds that the sacrament-order of Pope, bishop and priest is equal, he holds also that the hierarchical-order of Pope or bishop is superior to that of a *sacerdos simplex.* The hierarchical-order of the *sacerdos simplex* is not capable *a se* of calling into valid act every spiritual energy which is contained in the whole plenitude of his sacerdotal sacrament-order or character. For this, superior spiritual and official *potestates* are necessary.

In the system of St. Thomas, solid reasons are given for the papal delegation of priests for Confirmation or minor orders; and the scholastic tradition is preserved and perfected. Many modern theologians seem to break with the scholastics and, by considering the *episcopatus* a separate and distinct sacrament-order from the sacrament-order of priests, find it very difficult to explain how a minister of a lesser sacrament-order can validly confer sacraments which peculiarly pertain to ministers of a superior sacrament-order.

A writer who gives a solid and learned exposition of this whole subject is the Very Rev. Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. He has contributed to *The American Ecclesiastical Review* two important papers: "The Episcopate," in the issue of April, 1925; and "Origin of the Presbyterate," in the issue of March, 1930. In the following brief discussion, these papers will be designated as (I) and (II).

It is consoling that (I) generally allows the positions taken in this article, although there are variations. Dr. Connell does not expressly draw the distinction between sacrament-order and hierarchical-order, and so at times the reader has difficulty in understanding the precise point conveyed by his otherwise charming and lucid reasoning.

Dealing with the view that the episcopate is just a "completement" of the priesthood, he cites two opinions. The first, that the episcopate is an *intrinsic* extension of the priestly character, he rejects and definitely refutes. The second, that the episcopate, leaving the priestly character intrinsically unaltered, yet gives it an *extrinsic*

[15] *Ibid.,* q. 40, a. 7, *ad* 3.

extension, he seems inclined to favor. External extension "by the positive ordinance of God" extends the capacity of the recipient so that it includes "certain powers not possessed by a simple priest" (p. 340). It is illustrated by the analogy of a civil servant who is deputed by his sovereign "to exercise certain functions which heretofore were beyond the sphere of his authority."

Contrasting this position with the teaching of St. Thomas, it would seem that the Angelic Doctor would explain the matter by saying that *not* the priest's sacrament-character but his hierarchical-order is permanently extended. This extension would include a new power over persons (jurisdiction) and a new power over things (technically termed a "power of order" that is, of hierarchical-order; such as power to consecrate churches, oil of confirmation, etc.).

(II) leads off by asserting that using His "power of excellence" Christ *immediately* gave the Apostles "the plenitude of the priestly power, the episcopate," while, no doubt, all were subordinated to St. Peter whom Christ had made Head of the Church. Then this learned paper seems to be developed from one fundamental principle which rules both its interpretation of facts and its logic. Having posited that the priesthood is a generic term "applicable to two specifically distinct orders" (the episcopate and the presbyterate), Dr. Connell's fundamental principle seems truly that Christ *mediately* instituted the sacrament of orders—embracing, it appears, both the sacrament-order and the hierarchical-order, though the distinction is not expressly drawn. Mediate institution means that Christ gave His Church power to determine the different grades of order and the spiritual sacrament-efficiency and authority attached to each; and consequently also the valid right to formulate the rite or ceremony which would confer any particular grade. Dr. Connell, therefore asserts that "the Church determined to give the plenitude of the priesthood (ordinarily, at least) only to those who possessed the primatial governing power in each church, and to their subordinates in the hieratic ministry a limited measure of the priestly powers" (p. 229); he advocates staunchly the theory which, while asserting that the presbyterate is a portion of the priesthood established by Christ, yet "contends that the determination as to what measure of the priestly powers should constitute the presbyterate was made by the Church, in

virtue of a general commission granted to her by Christ" (p. 231).

Hence Dr. Connell thinks that when treating of the hierarchy, the Council of Trent, instead of "instituted by Christ" used "instituted by divine ordination" in order "to allow greater liberty to theological speculation": that though the grades which Trent mentions are *de fide* divine, there is no reason why the Church may not institute more; that the Church could formulate a rite whereby a deacon (or perhaps one less than deacon) might be immediately made a bishop; the present-day rite and others would not serve as they are meant only for priest-candidates, etc. Thus it may be seen that the learned writer works logically from his general principle.

Now it is not the purpose of this article fully to criticise Dr. Connell's theory—in which he is not alone—but to indicate somewhat its relation to the teaching of St. Thomas which this article upholds.

St. Thomas held that Christ *immediately* instituted all the sacraments[16] and that therefore He, not the Church, determined substantially and irrevocably the spiritual powers, authority and grade in the Church, which each confers. The higher order always includes whatever powers are in the lower. The sacrament-order of the simple priest contains essentially the entire plenitude of sacrament-orders. Hierarchical-order is in itself not a sacrament, though it may result from a sacrament-order, or from a consecration, or without either from a legitimate election as in the case of the Pope. Omitting peculiar details, it is obvious that Dr. Connell's theory is in full opposition to St. Thomas's theory and teaching. Nor can his appeal to St. Thomas (p. 231) as employing "the same hypothesis" be conceded.

It is true that in the *Supplement* (q. 37, a. 2, ad 2) we read: "In the early Church, owing to the fewness of ministers, all the lower functions were entrusted to deacons. . . . Nevertheless all the power to do such things was included in the one power of the deacon, though implicitly. When later divine worship developed, the Church expressly committed to several persons what she had hitherto implicitly committed to one order." But from the whole trend of his reasoning, it seems clear that St. Thomas meant not the Church determined new powers for a new order but that, when circumstances permitted, she employed persons who already possessed sufficient sacrament-order in the things proper to their

grade. Even now it happens sometimes that for a just reason a priest functions as a deacon, and later returns to his own sphere. At the Last Supper, the Apostles were immediately made priests; whether then or later they were made bishops seems immaterial. They were priests when made bishops, and having the priesthood could hand it on to others. This fact appears to be the fundamental basis of St. Thomas's theory, "no priest, no bishop." Nor is it unreasonable to postulate that St. Thomas knew the historical facts to which Dr. Connell refers (p. 233) and that he was quite conscientious and did not distort them.

St. Thomas, as we have seen, expressly taught that the episcopacy is *not* a sacrament; hence the writer of the present article interprets the institution of the hierarchy "by divine ordination" differently from Dr. Connell. It hardly need be said that it is good to examine different theories; such an examination helps to bring out clearly the ideas in question. Dr. Connell's papers deserve careful examination.

Briefly, if this present article does not err, St. Thomas teaches a sacred hierarchy instituted by divine ordination; he safeguards the dignity and power of Pope, bishop, and priest; he shows how a bishop is superior to a priest; and incidentally, perhaps, sheds a light on Trent, with which he seems in complete harmony.

JOSEPH BRODIE BROSNAN

Sacred Heart, Westhoughton,
Lancs., England

THE POWER OF MARY'S PRAYER

The faithful of every age, both in public misfortune and in private need, turn in supplication to Mary the benignant, so that she may come to their aid and grant help and remedy against sorrows of body and soul. And never was her most powerful aid hoped for in vain by those who besought it with pious and trustful prayer.

—Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical *Ingravescentibus malis,* issued Sept. 29, 1937.

THE DOCTRINAL AUTHORITY OF PAPAL ENCYCLICALS

Part I

Since the year 1878, when Pope Leo XIII began to rule, as Christ's vicar on earth, over the Church militant, over one hundred fifty encyclical letters have been issued by the Sovereign Pontiffs. These encyclical letters have exercised an incalculably powerful influence in the direction of Catholic teaching and of Catholic life. Appearing as they have, at an average rate of one in a little less than six months, these documents have come to be recognized as the most frequently used vehicles of the Holy Father's ordinary teaching of the flock entrusted to his care.

Despite their manifest and unique importance, however, the papal encyclicals have never been given anything like a completely adequate treatment in the literature of sacred theology. Some of the text-books used in our seminaries today give no special consideration whatever to the doctrinal authority of these documents. Others content themselves with a sweeping over-simplification and blithely dismiss all the encyclicals as "non-infallible" pontifical statements. A third group of authors, more scientific in their approach to this problem, maintain that these documents contain some infallibly true teachings, doctrines presented as infallible on the authority of the encyclicals themselves. Even within this last-mentioned group, however, we find most frequently little detailed explanation of the various norms by which we can recognize infallibly authoritative statements of the Holy Father's ordinary *magisterium* in his encyclical letters.

Despite the comparative inadequacy of the treatment they give to the papal encyclicals, however, all the theological works dealing with this subject make it perfectly clear that all Catholics are bound seriously in conscience to accept the teaching contained in these documents with a true internal religious assent. It is the common teaching of the theologians who have written on this subject that the internal assent due to a great number of the doctrines proposed in the papal encyclicals is something distinct from and inferior to both the act of divine Catholic faith and the act most frequently designated as *fides ecclesiastica.* Most theologians hold that,

while there is nothing to prevent an infallible definition of truth contained in or connected with the deposit of revelation in papal encyclicals, and while *de facto* it is quite probable that at least some infallible pronouncements have been made in this way, the Holy Father has not chosen to use the complete plenitude of his apostolic doctrinal authority in presenting most of the truths contained in his encyclical letters. Nevertheless they all insist that even in this portion of his ordinary *magisterium* the Holy Father has the right to demand, and actually has demanded, a definite and unswerving internal assent to his teachings from all Catholics.

Unfortunately, in our own day, we have encountered certain discussions of matters treated at some length in papal encyclicals by Catholic writers who have, for all practical purposes, disregarded and even opposed the pertinent statements in the pontifical documents. The men who have adopted this attitude seem to take cognizance of the common theological teaching that much of the material presented in the encyclicals does not come to us from the Holy Father with an absolute guarantee of infallibility. They seem, on the other hand to have forgotten the no-less-common doctrine of the theologians that the internal and sincere assent due to teachings presented even in a non-infallible way by the supreme teacher and ruler of the Church militant is definitely and seriously obligatory. The obligation holds until the Church might come to modify its position on some particular portion of the teaching contained in the encyclicals, or at least until the time when very serious reasons for such modification might become apparent.

The attitude to which we have referred makes at least a summary examination of the theologians' teachings about the doctrines contained in papal encyclicals imperative. In this examination we shall consider those writers who stress the non-infallible character of the teachings contained in these documents and then those who insist upon the fact that some of the statements propounded in the encyclicals can be or actually are infallible pronouncements. We shall begin, however, with a list of those authors who make no adequate mention of the encyclicals in their treatment of the Church's magisterium.

VARIOUS ATTITUDES AMONG THE THEOLOGIANS

An astonishingly large number of prominent theologians can be found among those who take no adequate cognizance of the en-

cyclical letters in their treatises on papal infallibility. These men content themselves with an examination of and a theological demonstration for the formula by which the Vatican Council defined the Holy Father's infallibility. Bishop Joseph Fessler,[1] the Vatican Council's secretary, used this approach in his reply to the "Old Catholic" Schultes. The famous and highly influential Cardinal Cammillus Mazzella[2] followed the same line, as did Archbishops Richard Downey,[3] Valentine Zubizarreta,[4] and Horace Mazzella,[5] Bishop Michael d'Herbigny,[6] Canon Auguste Leboucher,[7] and Fathers Sylvester Berry,[8] Hugo Hurter,[9] Sylvester Hunter,[10] Bernard Tepe,[11] Raphael Cercia,[12] Basil Prevel,[13] Gabriel Casanova,[14] and Gerard Paris.[15] As a group these writers frequently give the impression that they consider only those truths proposed by

[1] Cf. *La vraie et la fausse infaillibilité des papes* (Paris: E. Plon, 1873).

[2] Cf. *De religione et ecclesia praelectiones scholastico-dogmaticae,* 6th ed. (Prato: Giachetti, 1905).

[3] Cf. the article "The Vatican Council and Papal Infallibility," in the symposium *The Papacy,* edited by Fr. Lattey (Cambridge, England: W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd., 1924), pp. 181 ff.

[4] Cf. *Theologia dogmatico-scholastica ad mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis,* 3rd ed. (Bilbao: Eléxpuru Hnos., 1937), I, 396 ff.

[5] Cf. *Praelectiones scholastico-dogmaticae breviori cursui accommodatae,* 6th ed. (Torino: Società editrice internazionale, 1915), I, 545 ff.

[6] Cf. *Theologica de ecclesia,* 3rd ed. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1928), II, 349 ff.

[7] Cf. *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi speciali cura exactus ad normam recentium declarationum S. Sedis et Conc. Vaticani* (Paris: Berche et Tralin, 1877), pp. 255 ff.

[8] Cf. *The Church of Christ: An Apologetic and Dogmatic Treatise,* 2nd ed. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1927), pp. 472 ff.

[9] Cf. *Theologiae dogmaticae compendium in usum studiosorum theologiae,* 2nd ed. (Innsbruck: Wagner, 1878), I, 345 ff.

[10] Cf. *Outlines of Dogmatic Theology,* 3rd ed. (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1894), I, 441 ff.

[11] Cf. *Institutiones theologicae in usum scholarum* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1894), I, 383 ff.

[12] Cf. *Demonstratio catholica sive tractatus de ecclesia vera Christi et de Romano Pontifice,* 5th ed. (Paris: Lethielleux, 1878), II, 279 ff.

[13] Cf. *Theologiae dogmaticae elementa,* 3rd ed. (Paris: Lethielleux, 1912), I, 254 ff.

[14] Cf. *Theologia fundamentalis* (Rome: Typographia Sallustiana, 1899), pp. 328 ff.

[15] Cf. *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* (Turin: Marietti, 1929), pp. 229 ff.

the Holy Father *solemni iudicio* as infallibly defined, to the exclusion of those truths which he sets forth *ordinario et universali magisterio.*

Another very imposing group of theologians explicitly list the papal encyclicals, at least in a general way, as non-infallible documents. Bishop Hilarinus Felder,[16] Msgr. Caesar Manzoni,[17] and Fathers Emil Dorsch,[18] Reginald Schultes,[19] Antonio Vellico,[20] Ludwig Koesters,[21] Ludwig Lercher,[22] and Aelred Graham[23] teach thus in their treatises. This same view is set forth by Fr. Mangenot in his excellent article on the encyclicals in the *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique,*[24] by Fr. Lucien Choupin in his outstanding

[16] Cf. *Apologetica sive theologia fundamentalis,* 2nd ed. (Paderborn: Schoeningh, 1923), II, 266.

[17] Cf. *Compendium theologiae dogmaticae,* 4th ed. (Turin: Berruti, 1928), I, 225.

[18] Cf. *Institutiones theologiae fundamentalis,* 2nd ed. (Innsbruck: Rauch, 1928), II, 405.

[19] Schultes lists as infallible doctrinal decisions the pronouncements of Leo XIII on Anglican orders in his letter *Apostolicae curae,* and on Americanism in his letter *Testem benevolentiae,* and the teachings of Pius X in the encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis,* in his confirmation of the Holy Office decree *Lamentabili,* and in his Motu proprio, *Sacrorum antistitum,* in which the formula of the anti-Modernist oath is contained. He teaches that Pius IX made two dogmatic definitions, in the Bull *Ineffabilis Deus* and in his confirmation of the Vatican Council's decrees. All the other doctrinal acts during the recent pontificates up to 1930 are inferentially classified as non-infallible. Cf. *De ecclesia catholica praelectiones apologeticae,* 2nd edition prepared by Fr. Edmund Prantner (Paris: Lethielleux, 1931), pp. 643 ff.

[20] Cf. *De ecclesia Christi tractatus apologetico—dogmaticus* (Rome: Arnodo, 1940), p. 576.

[21] Cf. *The Church: Its Divine Authority,* translated by Dr. Edwin Kaiser (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1938), p. 267.

[22] Cf. *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae in usum scholarum,* 2nd ed. (Innsbruck: Rauch, 1934), I, 519.

[23] Cf. "The Church on Earth," in *The Teaching of the Catholic Church: A Summary of Catholic Doctrine* arranged and edited by Canon George D. Smith (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1949), II, 719.

[24] Mangenot teaches that "up to the present the encyclicals of the Popes do not constitute *ex cathedra* definitions of infallible authority," but he also teaches that the Holy Father can, if he wishes, issue infallible definitions in these letters. Cf. *DTC,* V, 15.

monograph,[25] by Fr. Thomas Pegues in his frequently quoted article in the *Revue thomiste* on the authority of the encyclicals,[26] and by Canon George Smith in his brilliant study on this subject in the *Clergy Review*.[27] Fr. Jean Vincent Bainvel, along with Choupin and Schultes, incidentally, refers explicitly to the encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII and classifies them as non-infallible,[28] while the article of Pegues was written as an answer to a question sent in to the *Revue thomiste* about the doctrinal authority of Pope Leo's encyclicals. Fr. Herman Dieckmann[29] classifies the doctrine contained in papal encyclicals with that of the Roman Congregations.

The distinguished theologians who deny the papal encyclicals the status of infallible documents teach, none the less, that the faithful are bound in conscience to accord these letters not only the tribute of respectful silence, but also a definite and sincere internal religious assent. To this end many of them, like Fr. De Groot,[30] apply to the encyclicals a teaching which the eminent and brilliant Dominic Palmieri had developed about the Catholic attitude towards non-infallible teaching in the Church.[31] Pegues, in his *Revue thomiste* article, makes this application with his usual clarity.

> Hence it follows that the authority of the encyclicals is not at all the same as that of the solemn definition, the one properly so-called. The definition demands an assent without reservation and makes a formal act of faith obligatory. The case of the encyclical's authority is not the same.
>
> This authority [of the papal encyclical] is undoubtedly great. It is, in a sense, sovereign. It is the teaching of the supreme pastor and teacher of the Church. Hence the faithful have a strict obligation to receive

---

[25] Cf. *Valeur des décisions doctrinales et disciplinaires du Saint-Siège*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1913), pp. 52 ff.

[26] "L'autorité des encycliques pontificales d'apres Saint Thomas," in *Revue thomiste* XII (1904), 512-32.

[27] "Must I Believe It?" in *The Clergy Review*, IX, 4 (April, 1935), 296-309.

[28] Cf. Bainvel, *De ecclesia Christi* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1925), p. 216; Choupin, *op. cit.*, pp. 52 f.; Schultes, *loc. cit.*

[29] Cf. *De ecclesia tractatus historico-dogmatici* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1925), II, 113.

[30] Cf. *Summa apologetica de ecclesia catholica ad mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis*, 3rd ed. (Regensburg: Manz, 1906), pp. 622 f.

[31] Cf. *Tractatus de Romano Pontifice cum prolegomeno de ecclesia*, 2nd ed. (Prato: Giachetti, 1891), pp. 718 ff.

this teaching with an infinite respect. A man must not be content simply not to contradict it openly and in a more or less scandalous fashion. An internal mental assent is demanded. It should be received as the teaching sovereignly authorized within the Church.

Ultimately, however, this assent is not the same as the one demanded in the formal act of faith. Strictly speaking, it is possible that this teaching [proposed in the encyclical letter] is subject to error. There are a thousand reasons to believe that it is not. It has probably never been [erroneous], and it is normally certain that it will never be. But, absolutely speaking, it could be, because God does not guarantee it as He guarantees the teaching formulated by way of definition.[32]

Lercher teaches that the internal assent due to these pronouncements cannot be called certain according to the strictest philosophical meaning of the term. The assent given to such propositions is *interpretative condicionatus,* including the tacit condition that the teaching is accepted as true "unless the Church should at some time peremptorially define otherwise or unless the decision should be discovered to be erroneous." [33] Lyons[34] and Phillips[35] use the same approach in describing the assent Catholics are in conscience bound to give to the Church's non-infallible teachings. Fr. Yves de la Brière speaks of the "submission and hierarchical obedience" due to these pronouncements.[36]

Msgr. Manzoni lists the encyclicals among the documents in which non-infallible teaching is to be found. He holds that the *definition* of which the Vatican Council speaks in proposing the doctrine of papal infallibility is to be found only in the exercise of the *solemn,* as distinguished from the *ordinary magisterium.* In explaining the binding force of these non-infallible pronouncements, he, like Bishop Francis Egger,[37] and Fathers Mangenot,[38] Mac-

[32] Pegues, *op. cit.,* pp. 531 f.

[33] Lercher, *op. cit.,* p. 520.

[34] Cf. *Christianity and Infallibility—Both or Neither,* 3rd impression (New York: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1916), pp. 283 f.

[35] Cf. *La saint église catholique* (Tournai and Paris: Casterman, 1947), pp. 306 ff.

[36] Cf. *L'église et son gouvernement* (Paris: Grasset, 1935), p. 32.

[37] Cf. *Enchiridion theologiae dogmaticae generalis,* 6th ed. (Brescia: Weger, 1932), p. 722.

[38] Cf. Mangenot, *loc. cit.*

Guinness,[39] and Dieckmann,[40] employs an explanation formulated by Cardinal Franzelin in his *Tractatus de divina traditione et scriptura.*

Franzelin holds that the Roman Pontiff can command all Catholics to assent to a given proposition (either directly or by condemning the contradictory statement), for either one of two different reasons. First the Holy Father can intend to define this proposition infallibly as true or as *de fide.* Again he can will merely to look after the security of Catholic doctrine. The *magisterium* of the Church has been equipped with help from God by reason of which the first sort of teaching gives infallible truth, while the second affords infallible security. Employing the plentitude of its power, the teaching Church operates as the *auctoritas infallibilitatis.* Working, not to define, but merely to take those steps it deems necessary to safeguard the faith, it is the *auctoritas providentiae doctrinalis.* To this *auctoritas providentiae doctrinalis* and to the teachings it sets forth, the faithful owe the obedience of respectful silence and of an internal mental assent according to which the proposition thus presented is accepted, not as infallibly true, but as safe, as guaranteed by that authority which is divinely commissioned to care for the Christian faith.[41]

The explanations developed by Franzelin and by Palmieri are adequate and exact. The first gives an excellent account of those teachings presented by the Holy See as propositions which can be taught safely. Palmieri, for his own part, offers a fine exposition of the status of propositions taught by competent authority, yet not presented as infallibly true. Both explanations can be employed profitably in dealing with some of the pronouncements of the various Roman congregations and with much of the teaching of the encyclicals. It would seem, however, that it would be a serious mistake to imagine that they can properly be applied to the entire body of doctrine set forth in these papal documents. It must be noted that neither Franzelin nor Palmieri made such an explicit application in the development of their own theories.

Several of the most influential modern theologians teach explicitly

[39] Cf. *Commentarii theologici,* 3rd ed. (Paris: Lethielleux, 1930), I, 441.

[40] Cf. Dieckmann, *op. cit.,* pp. 121 f.

[41] Cf. Franzelin, *De divina traditione et scriptura,* 3rd ed. (Rome: Cong. de Propaganda Fide, 1882), pp. 127 ff.

that some of the teachings in the papal encyclicals come to us as parts of the Church's infallible doctrine. Thus Tanquerey[42] and De Guibert[43] hold that some of the propositions set forth in the papal encyclicals are infallibly true since they are presented by the Holy Father in his infallible ordinary *magisterium*. Cardinals Billot[44] and Lepicier[45] teach that many of the pronouncements contained in the encyclicals are to be accepted as infallibly true. The manuals of Hervé,[46] Yelle,[47] Blanch,[48] Herrmann,[49] Scheeben,[50] and Saiz Ruiz[51] show that their authors are convinced that the encyclicals cannot simply be dismissed as non-infallible documents. The manuals of Wilhelm-Scannell,[52] Michelitsch,[53] Van Noort,[54] Pesch,[55] and Calcagno[56] come to the same conclusion in

[42] Cf. *Synopsis theologiae dogmaticae fundamentalis*, 24th edition, prepared by Fr. Bord (Paris: Desclée, 1937), pp. 633 f.

[43] Cf. *De Christi ecclesia*, 2nd ed. (Rome: Gregorian University, 1928), pp. 260 ff.

[44] Cf. *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi sive continuatio theologiae de Verbo Incarnato*, 5th ed. (Rome: Gregorian University, 1927), p. 656.

[45] Cf. *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* (Rome: Buona Stampa, 1935), p. 243.

[46] Cf. *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae*, 18th ed. (Paris: Berche et Pagis, 1934), I, 563.

[47] Cf. *De ecclesia et de locis theologicis* (Montreal: Grand Seminary, 1945), p. 35.

[48] Cf. *Theologia generalis seu tractatus de sacrae theologiae principiis* (Barcelona: Typographia de Montserrat, 1901), p. 584.

[49] Cf. *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae*, 7th edition, revised by Fathers Stebler and Raus (Lyons and Paris: Vitte, 1937), I, 473 f.

[50] Cf. *Handbuch der katholischen Dogmatik* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1873), I, 228 f.

[51] Cf. *Synthesis sive notae theologiae fundamentalis* (Burgos: Lib. del Centro Católico, 1906), p. 443.

[52] Cf. *A Manual of Catholic Theology*, 4th ed. (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1909), I, 96 f.

[53] Cf. *Elementa apologeticae sive theologiae fundamentalis*, 3rd ed. Graz and Vienna: Styria, 1925), p. 400.

[54] Cf. *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi*, 5th edition prepared by Dr. Verhaar (Hilversum, Holland: Brand, 1932), p. 202.

[55] Cf. *Institutiones propaedeuticae ad sacram theologiam*, 6th ed. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1924), p. 357.

[56] Cf. *Theologia fundamentalis* (Naples: D'Auria, 1948), p. 270. Calcagno teaches that *generally speaking*, the encyclicals do not contain infallible teaching.

another way, by warning their readers that not all of the teachings contained in the encyclicals are to be considered as infallible. Thurston also teaches that some of the teachings contained in the encyclicals are to be received as infallibly proposed.[57] Brunsmann contents himself with the observation that the doctrinal encyclicals impose an obligation upon the consciences of all the faithful.[58]

THE VATICAN COUNCIL AND THE HOLY FATHER'S ORDINARY MAGISTERIUM

Despite the divergent views about the existence of infallible pontifical teaching in the encyclical letters, there is one point on which all theologians are manifestly in agreement. They are all convinced that all Catholics are bound in conscience to give a definite internal religious assent to those doctrines which the Holy Father teaches when he speaks to the universal Church of God on earth without employing his God-given charism of infallibility. Thus, prescinding from the question as to whether any individual encyclical or group of encyclicals may be said to contain specifically infallible teaching, all theologians are in agreement that this religious assent must be accorded the teachings which the Sovereign Pontiff includes in these documents. This assent is due, as Lercher has noted, until the Church might choose to modify the teaching previously presented or until proportionately serious reasons for abandoning the non-infallible teaching contained in a pontifical document might appear.[59] It goes without saying that any reason which would justify the relinquishing of a position taken in a pontifical statement would have to be very serious indeed.

It might be definitely understood, however, that the Catholic's duty to accept the teachings conveyed in the encyclicals even when the Holy Father does not propose such teachings as a part of his infallible *magisterium* is not based merely upon the dicta of the theologians. The authority which imposes this obligation is that of the Roman Pontiff himself. To the Holy Father's responsibility of caring for the sheep of Christ's fold, there corresponds, on the part of the Church's membership, the basic obligation of following his directions, in doctrinal as well as in disciplinary matters.

[57] Cf. the article "Encyclical" in *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, V, 413 f.

[58] Cf. *A Handbook of Fundamental Theology*, adapted into English by Arthus Preuss (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1932), IV, 50.

[59] Cf. Lercher, *op. cit.*, p. 520.

In this field, God has given the Holy Father a kind of infallibility distinct from the charism of doctrinal infallibility in the strict sense. He has so constructed and ordered the Church that those who follow the directives given to the entire kingdom of God on earth will never be brought into the position of ruining themselves spiritually through this obedience. Our Lord dwells within His Church in such a way that those who obey the disciplinary and doctrinal directives of this society can never find themselves displeasing God through their adherence to the teachings and the commands given to the universal Church militant. Hence there can be no valid reason to discountenance even the non-infallible teaching authority of Christ's vicar on earth.

The Vatican Council, in its famous conclusion to the constitution *Dei Filius,* insisted very strongly upon the Catholic's duty to accept that portion of papal teachings in which the encyclical letters are included. The Council appended the following two statements to its first dogmatic constitution.

Itaque supremi pastoralis Nostri officii debitum exsequentes, omnes Christi fideles, maxime vero eos, qui praesunt vel docendi munere funguntur, per viscera Iesu Christi obtestamur, necnon eiusdem Dei et Salvatoris nostri auctoritate iubemus, ut ad hos errores a sancta Ecclesia arcendos et eliminandos, atque purissimae fidei lucem pandendam studium et operam conferant.

Quoniam vero satis non est, haereticam pravitatem devitare, nisi ii quoque errores diligenter fugiantur, qui ad illam plus minusve accedunt, omnes officii monemus, servandi etiam Constitutiones et Decreta, quibus pravae eiusmodi opiniones, quae isthic diserte non enumerantur, ab hac Sancta Sede prosciptae et prohibitae sunt.[60]

The most prominent commentator on this passage, the French theologian Jean Vacant, calls attention to the fact that the Council deliberately worded its admonition in such a way as to make it clear that the duty, incumbent upon all the faithful, of accepting and observing the various pontifical constitutions and decrees is founded upon the prerogatives of the Holy See itself.[61] All the Council seeks to do is to warn the members of the Church of an already existent obligation. The people are admonished to receive and to

[60] *DB,* 1819-20.

[61] Cf. *Études théologiques sur les constitutions du Concile du Vatican; La Constitution Dei Filius* (Paris and Lyons: Delhomme et Briguet, 1895), II, 332 f.

keep the doctrines proposed by the Holy Father through the documents to which the Council alludes, not because the Council teaches that such teachings are to be accepted, but rather because the Holy See, which obviously has the right to do so, has demanded such assent for its own teachings.

The Vatican Council speaks of a duty, of a moral obligation binding in conscience. All of the faithful are bound in conscience to keep, *i.e.*, to give a continuing assent, to these pontifical documents which proscribe and forbid those errors which are more or less closely related to "heretical wickedness." The Council specifically mentions the fact that it refers to errors not condemned explicitly in its own constitution.

It is important to note that the Vatican Council speaks of this obligation as something belonging to the integrity of the duty of faith itself. It warns the faithful that they must persevere in their assent to the teachings of the pontifical constitutions and decrees precisely because "it is not enough to keep away from heretical wickedness unless those errors which more or less closely approach it are also diligently avoided." The Council looks upon those errors castigated in the various documents emanating from the Holy See as factors which would ruin the purity of the faith in the man unfortunate enough to accept them.

Vacant and Scheeben make it clear that in speaking of the *Decreta* (as distinct from the Constitutiones), the Vatican Council definitely included the pronouncements of the various Roman Congregations among those teachings which Catholics are bound in conscience to accept perseveringly.[62] These pronouncements are unquestionably non-infallible statements. They have obviously less authority than those documents which emanate directly from the Holy Father, even when the Vicar of Christ does not intend to use the fullness of his apostolic teaching power. If these decrees of the Roman congregations are mentioned as doctrinal pronouncements "to be observed" by all of the faithful, then it is perfectly clear that the Vatican Council, speaking as the voice of the entire *ecclesia docens,* insists that the teachings set forth in papal encyclicals must be accepted sincerely.

The Vatican Council's exhortation has reference, immediately and directly, to those *Constitutiones et Decreta* which appeared

[62] Cf. Vacant, *loc. cit.;* Sheeben, *op. cit.,* I, 250.

prior to the promulgation of the *Dei Filius* and which dealt with doctrine closely connected with the teachings set forth in the *Dei Filius*. Indirectly however, by reason of the Council's mode of procedure, it most certainly affirmed the obligation incumbent upon all Catholics of accepting and assenting to the teachings presented to the City of God on earth, even in a non-infallible manner, by the Roman Pontiff. It must be remembered that the Council did not intend to oblige the faithful to accept these pontifical statements by reason of any command contained in the *Dei Filius*. It simply warned them to be faithful to the obligation already incumbent upon them by reason of the pontifical authority itself. The encyclicals which have appeared since the year 1870 have manifestly just as much claim to be accepted and believed by all the faithful as had the pontifical documents issued prior to that date.

The internal acceptance which Catholics are bound to give to that portion of the Church's teaching not presented absolutely as infallible is described as a "religious assent." It is truly religious by reason of its object and of its motives. The Vatican Council's conclusion to its Constitution *Dei Filius* stresses the religious object of this assent. The faithful are reminded of their obligation to believe the doctrinal pronouncements of the Roman Congregations because these statements denounce and forbid definite errors which are closely connected with "heretical wickedness" and which thus are opposed to the purity of the faith. Teachings that contradict errors of this sort are obviously religious in character since they deal more or less directly with the content of divine revelation, the body of truth which guides and directs the Church of God in its worship.

The letter *Tuas libenter,* sent on Dec. 21, 1863 by Pope Pius IX to the Archbishop of Munich, stresses in a singularly effective way the religious motivation of the assent Catholics are bound to give to those teachings presented in a non-infallible manner in the Church's ordinary *magisterium*. After reminding his readers that the dogma itself can be set forth by the Church's ordinary *magisterium* as well as in its solemn judgments, the great Pontiff made the following statement.

Sed cum agatur de illa subiectione, qua ex conscientia ii omnes catholici obstringuntur, qui in contemplatrices scientias incumbunt, ut novas suis scriptis Ecclesiae afferant utilitates, idcirco eiusdem conventus viri

recognoscere debent, sapientibus catholicis haud satis esse, ut praefata Ecclesiae dogmata recipiant ac venerentur, verum etiam opus esse, ut se subiciant decisionibus, quae ad doctrinam pertinentes a Pontificiis Congregationibus proferuntur, tum iis doctrinae capitibus, quae communi et constanti Catholicorum consensu retinentur ut theologicae veritates et conclusiones ita certae, ut opiniones eisdem doctrinae capitibus adversae quamquam haereticae dici nequeant, tamen aliam theologicam mereantur censuram.[63]

In this letter Pope Pius IX insists that the men in the assembly to which he refers (the men who took part in a Catholic theological meeting in Germany), must not lose sight of the fact that Catholic savants must submit themselves to the doctrinal pronouncements of the Roman Congregations "in order that they may bring new advantages to the Church by their writings." The Sovereign Pontiff shows himself keenly aware of the essentially functional nature of theological investigation. God calls men to work in the sacred sciences, not to form themselves into a more or less edifying debating club, but to labor effectively for His Church on earth. That labor is something which can be accomplished only under the direction of the Church and ultimately under the direction of the supreme teaching authority within the Church.

The motive for theological inquiry is thus something essentially religious, and the inquiry itself is definitely a corporate function, meant by its very nature to be carried on for the Church and under the Church's guidance. The man who refuses to place his thought and his teaching wholly under the Church's direction and who choses to ignore or to oppose sections of the Church's authoritative teaching on the ground that these sections are not absolutely guaranteed by the Church's charism of infallibility has definitely frustrated in advance any advantage which might have accrued to the Church through his efforts in the field of sacred theology. By his own decision he is out of harmony with the corporate labor and the direction of theological inquiry.

The "religious assent" of which the theologians speak is due to the individual doctrinal pronouncements of the various Roman Congregations. It is due on manifestly stronger grounds to the individual doctrinal pronouncements not presented as infallible

[63] *DB*, 1684.

teachings but set forth in papal encyclicals. Again, the obligation is even more powerful in the case of a body of teaching presented in a series of encyclicals.

It would manifestly be a very serious fault on the part of a Catholic writer or teacher in this field, acting on his own authority, to set aside or to ignore any of the outstanding doctrinal pronouncements of the *Rerum novarum* or the *Quadragesimo anno,* regardless of how unfashionable these documents be in a particular locality or at a particular time. It would, however, be a much graver sin on the part of such a teacher to pass over or to discountenance a considerable section of the teachings contained in these labor encyclicals. In exactly the same way and for precisely the same reason it would be seriously wrong to contravene any outstanding individual pronouncement in the encyclicals dealing with the relations between Church and State, and much worse to ignore or to disregard all of the teachings or a great portion of the teachings on this topic contained in the letters of Pius IX and Leo XIII.

It is, of course, possible that the Church might come to modify its stand on some detail of teaching presented as non-infallible matter in a papal encyclical. The nature of the *auctoritas providentiae doctrinalis* within the Church is such, however, that this fallibility extends to questions of relatively minute detail or of particular application. The body of doctrine on the rights and duties of labor, on the Church and State, or on any other subject treated extensively in a series of papal letters directed to and normative for the entire Church militant could not be radically or completely erroneous. The infallible security Christ wills that His disciples should enjoy within His Church is utterly incompatible with such a possibility.

In the matter of individual pronouncements, it is interesting to observe the teaching of one of the most competent and respected scholars in the Church on the doctrinal effect produced by a statement in a papal encyclical. The encyclical *Mystici Corporis* speaks of the bishops' ordinary power of jurisdiction as something "communicated to them immediately by the Sovereign Pontiff." Msgr. Alfredo Ottaviani, in the latest edition of his *Institutiones iuris publici ecclesiastici,* speaks of this doctrine as *"sententia, hucusque*

considerata probabilior, immo communis, nunc autem ut omnino certa habenda ex verbis Summi Pontificis Pii XII." [64]

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[64] *Institutiones iuris publici ecclesiastici*, 3rd ed. (Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1947), I, 413.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for August, 1899, the leading article, by Fr. L. A. Dutto, is an account of the apostolic labors of Fr. Eusebio Kino, S.J,. who did heroic missionary work in Arizona in the early part of the eighteenth century. The author thinks that "Fr. Kino should stand second on the list of American missionaries, yielding place to none but the renowned Bartolomé de las Casas, the Protector of the Indians". . . . Abbé Hogan, S.S., continues his series on church building with an article on the various styles of classical architecture—Greek, Roman and Byzantine. He believes that every priest who essays the building of a church should have some knowledge of these different styles of architecture. He states that all the styles used in past and present times in church building are comprised under the designation of classical and mediaeval architecture. . . . Writing on "Biblical Criticism and Biblical Theology," Fr. Bruneau, S.S., comments on some recent scriptural studies, and refers with commendation to an article that had appeared a few months previously from the pen of Alfred Loisy. . . . In the *Analecta* there is presented a decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Inquisition, commanding the conditional repetition of a priestly ordination in which, through inadvertence, no wine had been put into the chalice that was given into the hands of the ordinandi. [If such a case occurred today, there would be no necessity of repeating any of the ceremonies, as far as the validity of the ordination is concerned, because of the recent decree of Pope Pius XII, determining the requirements for valid ordination]. . . . Writing in the Conference section, an anonymous contributor defends the view that we do not know the proportionate numbers of the saved and the lost, against the opinion that it is sure that the majority of mankind are lost. . . . A writer points out that the prayer of "churching" a woman after childbirth contains a petition that the child may come to life eternal, and a decree of the Holy See has commanded that this clause is to be recited even when the child has died without Baptism—from which the writer concludes that we cannot be sure that the child is eternally lost.

F. J. C.

Answers to Questions

STIPEND FOR A BINATION MASS

Question: When a priest's bination Mass is celebrated at a late hour on Sunday, may he apply it for a stipend (even though he has already taken a stipend for the first Mass) by reason of an extrinsic title—that is, the lateness of the hour?

Answer: While a priest may accept remuneration for celebrating a bination Mass by reason of an extrinsic title—and the lateness of the hour is considered to be an extrinsic title—he may not accept the remuneration as a stipend for the ministerial fruits of the Mass. In other words, it is for the *celebration* of the Mass, not its *application* that he can accept some emolument if he has already offered one Mass for the intention of the donor of a stipend (or as his *Missa pro populo*). This remuneration is usually furnished in the form of his salary (if he is a pastor or assistant) or the offering given by the pastor (if he is a priest assisting for the Sunday), so that he has no claim to any additional remuneration for the Mass, though he may apply it gratuitously for the intention of some person who requests this application.

FACULTIES FOR HEARING A PRIEST'S CONFESSION

Question: In our archdiocese every priest may extend faculties for hearing his confession to any extradiocesan priest having faculties to hear confessions in his own diocese. However, in this concession it is stated that the delegated faculties may be granted and used *within the territory of the archdiocese.* Now, by virtue of this grant two priests from the archdiocese, not adverting to the clause *intra territorium nostrae archidioecesis,* heard each other's confession outside the archdiocese. Did they absolve each other validly?

Answer: The absolutions were not valid by virtue of the aforesaid concession. For the jurisdiction thus delegated is granted by the Ordinary of the place—the Archbishop—and hence, can be validly exercised only within the territory of the Archbishop (Can.

874, § 1). Hence, the priests did not absolve each other validly unless they possessed jurisdiction by virtue of common error. This problem would have to be settled by a consideration of the circumstances in which the confessions were heard. The question might be asked, if jurisdiction would be supplied in the event that the priests, at the time they heard each other's confession, had a doubt whether or not they could absolve validly. It would seem not, for the Code admits the concession of jurisdiction only when there is a *positive and probable doubt* (Can. 209), which would hardly be verified in such a case.

OBLIGATION TO CELEBRATE THE WEEKDAY MASS

Question: Is a pastor bound to say Mass in the parish church on weekdays in order that his parishioners may have an opportunity of assisting at the Holy Sacrifice and receiving Holy Communion? I am referring to the case of a pastor who regularly says Mass in a hospital chapel on weekdays, although Mass is also celebrated there by the chaplain for the benefit of the nurses and the patients. Some of the parishioners have requested the pastor to say Mass in the church but he refuses, his only reason being that the hospital chapel is more convenient for him. He claims that he is satisfying his obligation to his parishioners in that he says Mass in the church on Sundays.

Answer: The Code commands the pastor to celebrate the divine offices and administer the sacraments for the benefit of the faithful as often as they legitimately ask him (Can. 467, § 1). Unquestionably this includes the duty of celebrating Mass and giving Holy Communion on weekdays as well as on Sundays for those of his flock who wish to avail themselves of these divine blessings. This would not necessarily mean that Mass must be celebrated in the parish church. Thus, if a pastor wishes to celebrate Mass in the school convent or in a chapel in his rectory (presuming he has permission for this), and the parishioners who wish to attend can conveniently be accommodated, he is sufficiently providing for them. Similarly, in the case which the questioner proposes, if the hospital authorities allow the people to come to the pastor's Mass in the chapel and it is just as convenient for them to come to the hospital as to the church, the pastor is fulfilling his duty to his parishioners

by saying Mass in the chapel. But if it would be notably more inconvenient for his people to come to the hospital chapel, or if the hospital authorities would not be willing to admit the parishioners every morning (as would usually be the case) the pastor is certainly failing in his duty by depriving his flock of the opportunity of weekday Mass and Holy Communion, merely for the sake of his own convenience. If this happened frequently or regularly for a notable period of time—for example for five or six weeks—I think the pastor would be guilty of grave neglect of duty, in the presumption that some of his people are being refused the sacred ministrations which they are lawfully requesting of him.

THE "RHYTHM" IN PRE-MARITAL INSTRUCTIONS

Question: Is it feasible to mention in pre-marital instructions the use of Rhythm?

Answer: Nowadays when so much is being said in favor of contraception, the malice of this unnatural act should be emphasized in premarital instructions. Moreover since periodic abstinence or the "Rhythm" is much misunderstood both by Catholics and by non-Catholics—many believing that it is the "Catholic birth control method" approved without any qualification by the Church—the moral principles concerning the use of "Rhythm" should be explained. The main points to be brought out are: (1) There is a vast difference between contraception and the "Rhythm" because the former consists in the abuse of the sexual powers, the latter in the non-use of these powers at certain times in the month. (2) A married couple may use "Rhythm" only when both agree to the restrictions it involves. (3) This system may not be used if either of the parties will very probably yield to sins of incontinence in the period of abstinence from sexual relations. (4) A couple may not lawfully use the "Rhythm" unless they have a good reason for not having children, at least for the time being. It is certainly feasible to mention these points in pre-marital instructions so that Catholics may not enter the married state in ignorance of the moral aspect of this practice of periodic abstinence. It is hardly necessary to say that it is not the proper thing for a priest to explain the biological details of the "Rhythm."

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

A PUZZLING RUBRIC IN THE BREVIARY

Question: In the introductory section of the Breviary, entitled: *Rubricae generales breviarii* (XXII, 7), we read that *Gloria Patri* is to be said at the conclusion of all Psalms, except at the end of *Deus, Deus, meus* (Ps. 62) and *Laudate Dominum de coelis* (Ps. 148), both of which occur in the Lauds for Sunday. The reason assigned is because they are joined to other Psalms and the *Gloria* is to be said only at the end of the last Psalm. The difficulty is that these two psalms are not joined to any others and so the rubric is without meaning.

Answer: One of our readers has suggested a very plausible explanation of this apparently meaningless rubric. His opinion is that this direction was a rubric of the old Breviary, before the reform of Pope Pius X, and that, through inadvertance, it was carried over into the revised edition, published in accordance with the *Divino afflatu.* Sexagenarian priests will remember that Sunday Lauds of the old Office added Psalm 66 to 62 and Psalms 149 and 150 to number 148, making eight Psalms in all, counting the Canticle as one. They were recited, however, as five Psalms, as at present, this arrangement being made possible by deferring the *Gloria* at the end of Psalm 62 to the conclusion of Psalm 66, immediately following, and the *Gloria* of Psalm 148 to the end of Psalm 150, the final one of the series of three, which closed the Psalms of Lauds. This is, no doubt, the solution to the puzzle posed by this confusing rubric. Our informant, whom we thank for this answer to the difficulty, expresses the hope that when the *Breviarium novissimum* appears, with the lessons of the second nocturn revised, this outmoded rubric will also be corrected.

THE CANDLES ON THE *TENEBRAE* TRIANGLE

Question: It is the custom, locally, to use a white candle, representing Our Lord, as the top candle of the fifteen on the triangular candlestick used for the *Tenebrae* in Holy Week. We have been told that all the candles must be of unbleached wax. Does our local custom justify the single white candle?

Answer: All the candles of the triangular candlelabrum used at the *Tenebrae* in Holy Week should be of unbleached wax, like that of the six altar candles. Such is the provision of the *Caeremoniale*

episcoporum (Lib. II, xxii, 4) where it directs that the material of all the candles, at the *Tenebrae,* whether on the altar or on the triangle, be of unbleached wax (*cera communis*). Fortescue (*Ceremonies of the Mass Described,* p. 303 n), specifically states that there is no authority for using a white candle at the apex of the triangle. Such a practice would be *contra rubricas* and its justification would be regulated by the application of the principles governing customs in opposition to the rubrics (cf. Callewaert, *Liturgiae Insititutiones,* p. 137).

THE VEIL ON THE CRUCIFIX ON GOOD FRIDAY

Question: Should not a violet veil be used to cover the crucifix which is unveiled on Good Friday? In some places, a black one is used.

Answer: The Missal says nothing about the color of the veil used on the crucifix when it is unveiled on Good Friday. For that matter, it does not designate the color of the veils to be used for covering the crucifixes, statues, and pictures on the eve of Passion Sunday. The *Memoriale rituum* (V, 1) allows on Good Friday either violet or black, *secundum consuetudinem.* Hence, authorities generally conclude that on that day the veil may be of either color (Fortescue, *op. cit.,* p. 319; Baldeschi, *Le Sacre Cerimonie,* V, Cap. vii, et al.) Martinucci (II, xxvi, 1), however, speaks only of the black veil. Conclusion, either may be used.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

THE MISSIONARY NATURE OF CATHOLICISM

The duty of promoting, to the best of our power, the coming of God's kingdom is one binding upon all who have been called into that kingdom, and out of Satan's power, by their regeneration at the font. It is a duty which has been fulfilled in a hundred different ways through the long course of the centuries, at the cost of immense labors and hardships. To be a partaker in that kingdom means not only conforming our lives to its precepts, but also making efforts to see that its frontiers shall be daily enlarged, that new citizens may avail themselves of the spiritual privileges it offers.

—Pope Pius XII, in his encyclical *Summi pontificatus,* issued Oct. 20, 1939.

Book Reviews

DE MEDICINA PASTORALI. Recentiores quaestiones quaedam exponuntur. By Jacobus Pujiula, S.J. Turin: Marietti, 1948. Pp. viii+261. L. 800.

A specialized treatise on Pastoral Medicine always attracts the attention of priests and seminarians, for by its nature it is designed to aid them in the ministry of directing and saving souls. Hitherto a great deal has been written on the subject, but a modern, up-to-date treatise is always welcome. Such is Fr. Pujiula's work, which may well take its place side by side with similar excellent books on the same subject.

The author divides his work into three parts: the first explains somewhat at lengtn the anatomy and physiology of man. Numerous charts and diagrams in this section greatly contribute towards illustrating and simplifying rather complex problems and descriptions. In the second part the author takes up the study of man's relations to society; herein such questions as eugenics, hygiene, the usage of certain anaesthetics, and euthanasia are briefly but clearly expounded. The third part is chiefly devoted to problems that are intimately related to the administration of the sacraments and certain ecclesiastical laws. Usually a detailed bibliography is appended to most of the chapters and sections for the benefit of priests and students who might have a desire to pursue the subject more intensively.

Of special interest to the priest is the author's practical treatment of certain moral questions and objections raised by persons opposed to the teachings of Christ and His Church. The morality of using anaesthetics in child-birth, the illiceity of therapeutic abortions, questions pertaining to ectopic gestation—all are ably handled and discussed by the author. The chapters on heredity, venereal diseases, psychopathic infirmities, and the doctrines of Freud are excellently set forth from a scientific as well as a moral point of view. Of equal interest, too, is the author's treatment of eugenics and the rules which are advocated in the matter of educating young men and women to observe the virtue of chastity. In this latter connection he stresses the role that mothers should play in handling this delicate question. In the author's estimation mothers are probably more suited than fathers to impart the desired sexual information according to the child's age and demands; generally speaking, children confide more in their mother than in their father. She readily perceives their needs, understands their temperament and can select the time and the hour to reveal the mysteries of life in the most reverent manner possible.

On a few points theologians and physicians undoubtedly will disagree with the author. Certainly it is not true, as the author indicates (p. 47), that the rupture of the hymen is always a sign that marital relations have taken place. Neither will moralists and canonists in general agree fully with the author's view that the State or society has no authority whatever to insist upon prenuptial medical examinations. While it is true, as the author states, that the Church alone is competent to establish impediments, diriment or impedient, for Christian marriages, yet, Catholic theologians are quite agreed that the State enjoys some authority over marriage as long as it does not establish prohibitive impediments in such a way that the natural right of a man to marry is denied to him (Cf. J. William Goldsmith, *The Competence of Church and State over Marriage,* pp. 55-70).

Aside from these points, the author is to be commended for his skillful treatment of the subject. Unfortunately, however, it seems unlikely that his work will reach a large English-reading public on account of its Latin text. In view of this and the useful information it contains not only for priests and seminarians, but also Catholic doctors, may we express the hope that Fr. Pujiula's work be translated into English in the near future.

CHARLES H. PICKAR, O.S.A.

WITH CHRIST THROUGH THE YEAR: THE LITURGICAL YEAR IN WORD AND SYMBOLS. By Rev. Bernard Strasser, O.S.B. Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1947. Pp. xv+338. $3.75.

The Liturgical Year has been the subject-matter of many recent studies. By certain writers, like Dom Prosper Guéranger and Pius Parsch, it has been treated in finest detail. On the other hand, most translations of the Missal present the subject in bare outline-form. Father Strasser's volume stands in the middle ground, avoiding the plethora of information provided by the scholar, yet amplifying within the limits of practical reason the condensed schema peculiar to our modern Mass-book. Taking the form of an explanatory guide to the spirit of the Liturgy, which underlies and inspires external worship in its numberless phases, this volume presents the Liturgical Year in its historical and grace-giving significance, and aims to assist the faithful to appreciate more deeply its riches and its beauty.

The original of this volume was written and published in 1938 at the Abbey of Clervaux in the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg, a renowned old-world center of close living with the Liturgy. For the English edition the original has been revised and adapted to American needs and conditions with the assistance of the Benedictine Fathers of St. John's Abbey at Collegeville, Minnesota and the Benedictine Sisters of

St. Joseph, Minnesota. The illustrations, which add in no small measure to the worth of the volume, were originally drawn by Dom Pirmin Fox, of Clervaux, and were supplied by Sister M. A. Justina Knapp, O.S.B., the noted American authority on Christian Symbols. (cf. pp. 45-47).

In a rather comprehensive introduction, the meaning of liturgy and the various aspects of its function in Christian life are well portrayed. Decrying the misconception of liturgy as drama, recreation or artistic enjoyment, the author repeatedly emphasizes its essential note of service, specifically, that public official communal service of worship owed to God by Christians as members of Christ's Mystical Body. In its how, what, when and where, this duty of service is determined by Christ and His mouthpiece the Church, which thus continues through the centuries the redemptive work of Her Divine Founder. In portraying the role of the Liturgy in Christian life, the author explains the several phases of liturgical solidarity in ever-widening circles extending from the family to the Church Universal, and involving seasons, places, things, persons and ritual, by means of which the sanctification of Sunday, the week-day, the week, the year, and a whole lifetime is effected.

The greater part of the work is concerned with the temporal and sanctoral cycles of the Liturgical Year, to an extent consistent with the author's general purpose. His treatment of each succeeding period in the temporal cycle is interspersed with tales of many choice and informative customs and traditions which the years have rendered sacred in various parts of the world, e.g., the Advent wreath (pp. 70-71), the wine of St. John the Evangelist (p. 85), the monastic blessing of the lamb on Holy Saturday (p. 139), etc. His pages on the Church's autumn as symbolized by the post-Pentecostal period, and his portrayal of the manner in which the Church, in celebrating the feasts of Her Saints, keeps before Her children their own eternal goal, are particularly worthy of commendation.

The feast of St. Martin of Tours occurs, however, on November 11 (not November 12), (p. 312). And on the Friday of Passion Week the Church dwells particularly on the last four (not the last three) of Our Lady's Seven Sorrows (p. 293).

Father Strasser describes the Liturgical Year, as primarily neither a commemoration of redemption's historic events, nor a dim anticipation of eternity's matchless joy, but rather as a re-presenting of those all-important acts and events which, taken together, constitute the Divine Economy of salvation, yet in such a way that they might be a means of constantly nourishing the supernatural life within the members of Christ's Mystical Body. His worthy volume serves to make

our annual journey through the year, not a retracing of the selfsame road, but rather an ever deeper penetration into the great mysteries of our Faith.

EDWARD F. DOWD

THE CEREMONIES OF THE ROMAN RITE DESCRIBED. By Adrian Fortescue. American Edition. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press. 1949. Pp. xviii + 431. $4.50.

Any volume from the pen of the late Adrian Fortescue will be recognized as a worthy contribution to liturgical literature. His *The Mass, a Study of the Roman Liturgy,* is a classic long appreciated for its scholarship, its critical evaluation of sources, and its well-written presentation of the development of the Roman Rite. Fortescue's books on the Eastern Liturgies, both Catholic and dissident, claim a place in every library of works on the ceremonial worship. So also, when he came to write a book on ceremonies as they should be conducted in the Roman Rite, his *Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described* appeared and proved to be a comprehensive and convenient manual, perhaps the best extant in English to-day. One would wish that our *Baltimore Ceremonial* could be re-written with the orderly arrangement, critical notes, and good English which distinguish the Fortescue book on the subject.

The Ceremonies of the Roman Rite Described was published in 1917 and has gone through seven editions, the later ones being revised by the Reverend J. C. O'Connell. The present eighth edition has been further revised and augmented by notes concerning the ritual for the reception of converts and for the celebration of marriage, as practiced in the United States. The nuptial rite with us lacks the English ceremony of presenting gold and silver coins to the bride as also the custom of placing the ring on the hand of the bride by inserting it successively on the thumb, the index finger and the second finger before putting it in its permanent place on the ring finger. We have not the civil declaration before the registrar, after the ceremony, as is required in England. Our order for the reception of converts is somewhat less solemn than that usually followed in England so this edition supplements the original chapter of Fortescue by one detailing the rite customary in America.

We can recommend, without reserve, this new edition of a standard ceremonial as adapted to conditions and practices in this country. All the attractive features of the first edition have been retained. It is an accurate guide for the conduct of all the ceremonies which are held in parish churches and includes some pontifical ceremonies also. In addition to the directions for the celebration of Mass, Low Mass, High Mass, and Pontifical Mass, and for functions usually associated with the Holy Sacrifice, the book treats of the ceremonies for the adminis-